arXiv:1512.06654v2 [math.GT] 26 Jun 2016

BOTT–TAUBES/VASSILIEV COHOMOLOGY CLASSES BY CUT-AND-PASTE TOPOLOGY

ROBIN KOYTCHEFF

Abstract. Bott and Taubes used integrals over configuration spaces to produce finite-type (a.k.a. Vassiliev) knot invariants. Their techniques were then used to construct "Vassiliev classes" in the real cohomology spaces of knots and links in higher-dimensional Euclidean spaces, using classes in graph cohomology, as first promised by Kontsevich. Here we construct integer-valued cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for odd $d > 3$. We construct such a class for any integer-valued graph cocycle, by the method of gluing compactified configuration spaces. Our classes form the integer lattice among the previously discovered real cohomology classes. Thus we obtain nontrivial classes from trivalent graph cocycles. We obtain an analogous result for even $d > 3$ over $\mathbb{Z}/2$. Our methods also generalize to constructing mod-p classes out of mod-p graph cocycles, which need not be reductions of classes over the integers.

1. Introduction

This work focuses on spaces of embeddings of 1-manifolds into Euclidean space. The quintessential example of such an embedding space is the space of knots in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Its path components are isotopy classes of knots, and locally constant functions on this space are precisely knot invariants. Our main result is a construction of cohomology classes in these embedding spaces, which are thus generalizations of invariants of knots and links. This work also opens a new potential avenue for studying the classical case of knots invariants.

Briefly, our key methods are further developments of the method of configuration space integrals pioneered by Bott and Taubes [4]. These integrals provided a topological interpretation of knot invariants coming from perturbative Chern–Simons field theory in quantum physics and also generalized the Gauss linking integral from links to knots. Parametrizing these integrals by the space of knots, one can view them as integrals along the fiber of a bundle over that space. Configuration space integrals produce all finite-type knot invariants [31, 35], as well as real cohomology classes in spaces of knots [7] and links [18], invariants of homology 3-spheres [20, 21], and characteristic classes of homology sphere bundles [36, 37]. All of these ideas were outlined in the visionary work of Kontsevich [13, 14]. In our relatively recent work, we considered the setting of cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links (including knot and link invariants) and carried out "homotopy-theoretic Bott–Taubes integration" by replacing integration of differential forms by a Pontrjagin–Thom construction [16, 15]. This produced cohomology classes with *arbitrary* coefficients rather than just real coefficients. In subsequent work, we refined this construction by gluing configuration spaces and thus recovered the Milnor triple linking number for string links [17, 15].

Our first main result here is to produce cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are integer-valued for d odd and $\mathbb{Z}/2$-valued for d even:

Theorem 7.1. *For each integer-valued graph cocycle γ, there is a fiber bundle $F_\gamma \to X_\gamma \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$ over the space of m-component long links in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58D10, 55R80, 81Q30, 57M27, 55R12.

Key words and phrases. configuration spaces, Bott–Taubes integrals, Vassiliev classes, singular cohomology of spaces of knots and links, graph cohomology, gluing, finite-type invariants, degrees of maps.

This work was supported partly by NSF grant DMS-1004610 and partly by a PIMS Postdoctoral Fellowship.

- *for $d > 3$ odd, there is a map*
$$H^*(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^{*-\dim F_\gamma}(\mathcal{L}^d_m; \mathbb{Z})$$
such that the images of certain elements over all cocycles γ span an integer lattice among the configuration space integral cohomology classes; and
- *for $d > 3$ even, there is a map*
$$H^*(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2) \longrightarrow H^{*-\dim F_\gamma}(\mathcal{L}^d_m; \mathbb{Z}/2),$$
such that the images of certain elements over all cocycles γ span the space of mod-2 reductions of classes in an integer lattice of configuration space integral cohomology classes.

By "configuration space integral cohomology classes" above, we mean the $\mathbb{R}$-vector space of the classes constructed by Cattaneo, Cotta-Ramusino, and Longoni [7] in spaces of knots (and generalized to spaces of links in joint work with Munson and Volić [18]). By "integer lattice" above, we mean a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module in this $\mathbb{R}$-vector space. Many of the configuration space integral cohomology classes are already known to be nontrivial, and thus the same is true of our $\mathbb{Z}$- and $\mathbb{Z}/2$-valued classes above.

Furthermore, we see that our construction can be generalized to mod-p cohomology classes which need not be reductions of the integer-valued classes. Apropos of this second point, we conjecture that this method can be used to deduce counting formulae for finite-type invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, akin to the arrow diagram formulae of Goussarov, Polyak and Viro [10, 26].

The main idea behind our method is simple. Calculating an invariant of knots, links, or 3-manifolds as a sum of configuration space integrals is morally equivalent to calculating the degree of a map, a purely topological feature. This equivalence can be made precise by gluing different configuration spaces together. This approach was pursued in various levels of detail in the work of Kuperberg and Thurston in the case of 3-manifold invariants [20]; the work of Polyak and Viro in the case of the type-2 knot invariant [27]; the work of Poirier in the case of all finite-type invariants of knots and links [25]; and our previous work in the case of the triple linking number for long links [17]. The basic idea appears even in the original work of Bott and Taubes [4].

To make this idea precise and topologically reformulate fiberwise integration, we proceed via the cross product in singular homology. This is in contrast to the Pontrjagin–Thom constructions we used in our previous works on this subject. So our present construction is at the level of (co)homology rather than at the level of spaces or spectra. The benefit is that we avoid the technical obstacle of endowing the glued configuration space with a smooth structure. The drawback is that we lose potential classes in generalized cohomology theories with respect to which the configuration space bundles involved are orientable. On the other hand, singular cohomology with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/p$ are the main cohomology theories which come to mind in this setting (in addition to de Rham cohomology).

We now make some remarks on technical aspects for experts. Because of Stokes' Theorem, a key step for constructing link invariants or cohomology classes is ensuring that the integral along the boundaries of the configuration spaces is ultimately zero. The abovementioned gluing of configuration spaces corresponds to the way in which they combine to yield zero. There are three ways in which this can happen: (1) two non-vanishing integrals along a pair of (*principal*) faces cancel; (2) the integral along a (*hidden*) face vanishes by symmetry; (3) the integral along a face vanishes by degeneracy of the form to be integrated. Topologically treating case (2) is most easily done by using a "smaller" compactification of configuration space than the Axelrod–Singer/Fulton–Macpherson compactification. Specifically, we use a compactification which was considered by Kuperberg and Thurston. (A compactification considered by Poirier appears to be similar to this one.) Our gluing construction is also similar to theirs, but different in that we construct a glued space for each graph cocycle, rather than one glued space for all trivalent graph cocycles. Moreover, we consider cocycles which are not necessarily trivalent.

For technical reasons, our methods succeed over $\mathbb{Z}$ only when the ambient dimension d is odd, while for even d they succeed only over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ (see Section 5). It is possible, though not obvious to us, that some modification of our methods can produce $\mathbb{Z}$-valued classes the case of even d as well.

We restrict to *long* links. We can quite possibly treat closed links as well, though not all our arguments below immediately apply in that case (see Lemma 6.4).

The fact that our methods do not completely work in the case $d = 3$ is related to the integrals over the "anomalous faces" of configuration space. Whether the integrals vanish along these faces is an open problem, which was studied in some detail in work of Poirier [25] and unpublished work of Yang [38]. In the setting of homology sphere invariants, a framing of the manifold can be used to collapse this face to lower dimension. Thus, the problem in the setting of knot invariants can perhaps be summarized as the failure of a framing of the knot to respect the spherical maps (defined in Section 4.2). In any case, this problem is what stymies our topological construction for $d = 3$.

We suspect that our construction is adaptable to the setting of characteristic classes of bundles of homology spheres [36, 37, 20, 21], roughly generalizing from S^d to homology spheres. We feel that the details of the construction for cohomology of spaces of embeddings are sufficiently complicated, so for the sake of simplicity, we leave this generalization for future work.

1.1. **Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we provide background on spaces of knots and links, graphs, orientations of graphs, graph cohomology, and fiberwise integration via the cross product in singular homology.

In Section 3, we define a compactification of configuration spaces. This compactification, which is "smaller" than that of Fulton–Macpherson and Axelrod–Singer, previously appeared in the preprint of Kuperberg and Thurston on 3-manifold invariants [20].

In Section 4, we define bundles over spaces of links whose fibers are the compactified configuration spaces from Section 3. We review the construction of real cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links by fiberwise integration of forms, as in the work of Bott and Taubes [4] and Cattaneo et al [7]. Although our main gluing construction makes no direct use of real coefficients or de Rham cohomology, we need this material to establish the nontriviality of our classes.

In Section 5, we describe the gluings of the compactified configuration space bundles described in Section 3. This construction involves gluing, folding, and collapsing various codimension-1 faces, while still leaving some faces to the relative locus. Section 5 is perhaps the most technical part of the paper, due to careful accounting of orientations (mainly for the case of d odd). Ultimately, we establish that the glued space has fundamental cycle, as well as a map to an appropriate quotient of a (symmetric) product of spheres.

In Section 6, we show that the Bott–Taubes configuration space bundle, and moreover the bundle of glued configuration spaces constructed in Section 5, has the cohomology of a product.

In Section 7, we deduce our main theorem, Theorem 7.1. Using the results of Section 6 on the glued bundle constructed in Section 5 (and the cross product in homology), we construct cohomology classes which form an integer lattice among the classes obtained by integration of forms. We discuss some examples, such as the type-2 invariant for knots and the (type-2) triple linking number for long links.

In Section 8, we deduce some further results. We show in Proposition 8.1 that our construction generalizes to $\mathbb{Z}/2$, producing classes out of graph cocycles over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ which are not obviously mod-2 reductions of classes over $\mathbb{Z}$. Such a generalization is also possible over $\mathbb{Z}/p$ for odd primes p, though we discuss this case only very briefly. We then show in Proposition 8.4 that a variation of our construction can be carried out over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ in the classical case $d = 3$. Though we do not have a method for detecting nontriviality of such classes, we conjecture that our methods here can be used to deduce fairly simple counting formulae for finite-type invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$.

1.2. **Acknowledgments.** We thank the referee for many useful comments and suggestions.

2. Basic definitions, conventions, and background

Here we provide basic definitions and background material on spaces of links (Section 2.1), graphs and their orientations (Section 2.2), the graph cochain complex (Section 2.3), and fiberwise integration as an application of the cross product in homology (Section 2.4).

2.1. **Spaces of knots and links.** Let $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ denote the space of long m-component links in $\mathbb{R}^d$. By the space of long links, we mean the space of embeddings of $\coprod_m \mathbb{R}$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$ with fixed linear behavior outside $\coprod_m [-1,1]$. For technical reasons, the fixed linear behavior is required to have distinct directions for distinct strands (see [18]). We will also write $\mathcal{K}^d$ for the space of long knots $\mathcal{L}^d_1$. This paper concerns cohomology classes in spaces of knots and links. In the case of $d = 3$, degree-0 cohomology classes are precisely invariants of knots and links, so arbitrary cohomology classes generalize knot and link invariants. Much of our work below would apply equally well to spaces of closed links $\mathrm{Emb}(\coprod_m S^1, \mathbb{R}^d)$, though for a technical reason, it will eventually be easier for us to deal with long links.

2.2. **Graphs.** We define certain types of graphs which are crucial for our constructions. Fix an oriented 1-manifold L with finitely many components. We mainly consider the case where L is a disjoint union of finitely many copies of the real line. It will be convenient to also allow the case $L = \varnothing$, even though the empty set may not qualify as a 1-manifold.

Definitions 2.1. An *unoriented graph* or *unoriented diagram* Γ on L consists of

- $V(\Gamma)$, the set of *vertices*, which is partitioned as $V(\Gamma) = V_{seg}(\Gamma) \sqcup V_{free}(\Gamma)$ into *segment vertices* which lie on L and the remaining *free vertices*; and
- $E(\Gamma)$, the set of *edges*, which abstractly are unordered pairs of vertices (which they join); we call the pair of vertices as the *endpoints* of an edge, and we call a pair of an edge and one of its endpoints an *edge-end*.
- A part of L between two segment vertices is called an *arc*. It is not considered an edge, but like an edge, it has *endpoints* and *ends*.

We require the valence of each vertex to be at least 3, where ends of edges and arcs alike count towards valence; an edge may not join a free vertex to itself; and if $L \neq \varnothing$, we require that each component of Γ be connected to L. A *chord diagram* is a graph with no free vertices.

A self-loop on a segment vertex is allowed as an edge, and multiple edges (or edge(s) and an arc) may join the same pair of vertices. Let $U(\Gamma)$ denote the the result of forgetting L. Then $U(\Gamma)$ is "at least unitrivalent" in the sense that each free vertex has valence ≥ 3 and each segment vertex has valence ≥ 1. Let $T(\Gamma)$ denote the result of forgetting the complement of arcs in L. Then $T(\Gamma)$ is just an "at least trivalent" graph. So if $L = \varnothing$, then $U(\Gamma) = T(\Gamma) = \Gamma$. A graph Γ is thus a combinatorial object, but occasionally it will be convenient to view it (in an obvious way) as a 1-dimensional CW-complex.

For now, we will use "graph" to mean "unoriented graph". Below, we will orient our graphs by adding certain decorations, and that point we will only omit the adjectives "unoriented" and "oriented" when the meaning is clear from the context.

Definitions 2.2. A vertex of a graph Γ is called a *cut vertex* if its removal disconnects Γ. A graph Γ is *biconnected* if it is connected and has no cut vertices. Call a maximal biconnected subgraph of Γ a *block* of Γ.

Some authors use either "vertex-2-connected" or "2-connected" instead of "biconnected." We prefer "block" to the lengthier term "biconnected component"; Kuperberg and Thurston use the term "lobe" instead of "block." Note that a single edge Γ is biconnected, but a single vertex is not.

Lemma 2.3. *The intersection of any two distinct blocks Γ_1, Γ_2 of Γ is at most one vertex, which is necessarily a cut vertex of Γ.*

Proof. If $\Gamma_1 \neq \Gamma_2$ intersect in more than one vertex, then it is easy to see that their union is biconnected, contradicting maximality. If Γ_1, Γ_2 intersect in a vertex u that is not a cut vertex, then the removal of u leaves Γ connected. Thus we can find a path from a vertex v in $\Gamma_1 \setminus \Gamma_2$ to a vertex w in $\Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1$ which does not pass through u. Adjoining this path to $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ creates a biconnected graph, again contradicting maximality. □

Define $\Upsilon(\Gamma)$, the *block-cut tree of* Γ, to be the graph with a vertex for every block of Γ and every cut vertex of Γ, and an edge for every pair of block and cut vertex contained in that block. It is easily shown that $\Upsilon(\Gamma)$ is indeed a tree (for otherwise we contradict the maximality of the blocks).

Lemma 2.4. *If $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_j$ are the blocks of Γ, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} |V(\Gamma_i)| = |V(\Gamma)| + |E(\Upsilon(\Gamma))|$$

Proof. Notice that the left-hand side counts vertices of Γ, except that it counts cut vertices as many additional times as there are edges in the block-cut tree of Γ. □

The following easily verified lemma will be useful in Section 5.4:

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose v is a vertex in a subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ which is bivalent in Γ', joined to vertices u, w. If $\Gamma'' \subset \Gamma'$ is biconnected and contains v, then Γ'' either is one of the two edges in Γ' containing v or contains both u and w.* □

Definitions 2.6. A *labeled graph* or *labeled diagram* is a graph Γ together with a *labeling*. If d is odd, a labeling consists of an ordering of the vertices, an orientation on each edge, and additionally an ordering of the two edge-ends of each self-loop on a segment vertex. If d is even, a labeling consists of an ordering of the segment vertices and an ordering of the edges (including self-loops on segment vertices). Define the *orientation relations* $\sim$ as follows:

> For odd d, if Γ and Γ' differ only by a permutation σ of the vertex labels, a reversal of the orientations on k edges, and ℓ transpositions of the orderings of the self-loop edge-ends, then $\Gamma \sim \mathrm{sign}(\sigma)(-1)^{k+\ell}\Gamma'$.
>
> For even d, if Γ and Γ' differ only by a permutation σ of the vertex labels and a permutation of the edge-labels, then $\Gamma \sim \mathrm{sign}(\sigma)\mathrm{sign}(\tau)\Gamma'$.

Call the resulting equivalence class of a labeling an *orientation* and the resulting equivalence class of graph an *oriented graph* or *oriented diagram*. For a labeled or oriented graph Γ, let $|\Gamma|$ be the underlying unoriented graph. By an *isomorphism* of graphs $\Gamma \to \Gamma'$, we will mean an isomorphism of the underlying unoriented graphs, i.e., a homeomorphism of 1-dimensional CW-complexes. Such an isomorphism is *orientation-preserving* or *orientation-reversing* according to the induced change of labeling.

For example, line (6) in Section 4.4 below is a linear combination of labeled diagrams, which may then be considered as a linear combination of oriented diagrams. For d even, our methods will ultimately apply only with $\mathbb{Z}/2$ coefficients, but we will keep track of graph orientations in this case as much as possible, for the sake of potential future improvements upon our present work.

If e is an edge or arc in a labeled graph Γ joining vertices i, j, the *contraction* Γ/e of e has the usual quotient of CW-complexes as its underlying unoriented graph. The vertex labels on Γ/e are given by lowering by 1 those vertex labels greater than $\max(i, j)$ and by assigning $\min(i, j)$ to the vertex that is image of e. For d odd, if the contraction of e introduces a self-loop (necessarily on a segment vertex), then the order of its edge-ends is determined by the orientation of L. For d even, the labels on the edges are given by lowering by 1 those labels greater than that of e.

2.3. **The cochain complex of oriented graphs.** The oriented graphs defined above can be organized into a cochain complex. This construction is not particularly elementary, but we include it in this early Section as a distillation of much of the combinatorics of configuration space integrals.

Definitions 2.7. Let $\mathcal{D}$ denote the free module over a fixed ring R on oriented diagrams, modulo the orientation relations and the following relation:

If Γ has a pair of vertices joined by multiple edges, then $\Gamma \sim 0$.

- Define the *defect* of a diagram Γ to be $2|E(\Gamma)| - |V_{seg}(\Gamma)| - 3|V_{free}(\Gamma)|$.
- Define the *order* of Γ to be $|E(\Gamma)| - |V_{free}(\Gamma)|$

Let $\mathcal{D}_n^k$ denote the submodule of diagrams of defect k and order n, so that $\mathcal{D} = \bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{D}_n^k$.

In principle, R can be any ring, but we will only consider the cases where R is $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Z}$, or $\mathbb{Z}/p$. Note that Cattaneo et al use the term "degree" instead of "defect." As in [18], we reserve the term "degree" for cohomological degree. Note that the diagrams with defect 0 are precisely those which are (uni)trivalent, in the sense that each free vertex is trivalent and each segment vertex has one edge and two arcs emanating from it. It turns out that it is precisely the defect-0 cocycles which index finite-type invariants of knots and links in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

The coboundary operator is constructed to encode which configuration space integrals yield closed forms (see Section 4.4). It is a map $d : \mathcal{D}_n^k \to \mathcal{D}_n^{k+1}$. One defines it on each graph Γ and then extends it to $\bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{D}_n^k$ by linearity. On a graph Γ, it is defined as a signed sum

$$d\Gamma := \sum_e \varepsilon(e)\Gamma/e$$

over all arcs and non-self-loop edges e. We first define the sign $\varepsilon(e)$ for d odd. Suppose e is an edge or arc with endpoints $i < j$, and set

$$\varepsilon(e) := \begin{cases} (-1)^j & \text{if } e = (i \to j) \\ (-1)^{j+1} & \text{if } e = (i \leftarrow j) \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

If d is even and e is an *arc* with endpoints $i < j$, define $\varepsilon(e)$ as above (where the arc orientation comes from the orientation of L). If d is even and e is an *edge*, set

$$\varepsilon(e) = (-1)^{e+1+|V_{seg}(\Gamma)|} \tag{2}$$

where by abuse of notation e also denotes the label on this edge. The following theorem was proven in detail by Cattaneo et al over $\mathbb{R}$, but the proof shows that $d^2 = 0$ on the basis elements (the graphs), so the statement holds for any ring. Similar constructions appear in other contexts in topology, all of which were outlined in the work of Kontsevich [13].

Theorem 2.8 ([7])**.** *The sequence* $(\bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{D}_n^k, d)$ *is a complex, i.e.,* $d^2 = 0$.

As an alternative to relabeling the vertices of Γ/e and the above sign, we sometimes think of the contracted edge as still existing infinitesimally, as in Figure 1 in Section 5 below. This is useful for consistently orienting the principal faces that are to be glued.

The combinatorial input data for our construction will be a graph cocycle γ, which is a linear combination of oriented diagrams, but can be represented (in many ways) by a linear combination of labeled diagrams.

2.4. **Fiberwise integration in singular cohomology.** Ordinary integration over a manifold M is given by pairing with the fundamental class $[M]$. Similarly, integration over the fiber of a bundle $F \to E \to B$ can be described via a pairing that involves the fundamental class of the fiber $[F]$, at least in certain cases. Readers seeking background on fiberwise integration may wish to consult the books of Bott and Tu [5] and Greub, Halperin, and Vanstone [11].

Consider a product bundle $X = B \times F$ where both B and F are compact, oriented manifolds. Recall that in singular homology with any coefficient group, there is a cross product on chains

$$C_p(B) \otimes C_k(F) \to C_{p+k}(B \times F)$$

which descends to a map in homology. Suppose also that k is the dimension of F. Fixing a fundamental cycle $[F] \in C_k(F)$ gives a map

$$- \times [F] : C_p(B) \to C_{p+k}(B \times F)$$

Lemma 2.9. *(1) For a product bundle $B \times F \to B$, the map on cohomology*

$$H^{p+k}(B \times F) \to H^p(B)$$

induced by the dual to the map on chains $a \mapsto a \times [F]$ agrees with integration along the fiber.

(2) If F has boundary, then the map on cohomology

$$H^{p+k}(B \times F,\ \partial(B \times F)) \to H^p(B)$$

induced by the dual to the map on chains $a \mapsto a \times [F, \partial F]$ agrees with integration along the fiber.

Proof. For statement (1), let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the pairing between chains and cochains. Let $a \in C_p(B)$, and let $\beta \in C^{p+k}(B \times F)$ be a de Rham cochain. Let β also denote a singular cohomology representative of the cohomology class of β. Then $\langle \beta, a \times [F] \rangle = \int_{a \times [F]} \beta = \int_a \left(\int_F \beta \right) = \langle \int_F \beta, a \rangle$. Statement (2) is the relative analogue of statement (1) and its proof requires just the fact that integration over F when $\partial F \neq \varnothing$ can be expressed as a pairing of relative chains and cochains. □

3. Compactified configuration spaces

In this Section, we define certain configuration spaces (Section 3.1), compactifications of them (Section 3.2), and their corner structure (Section 3.3). These compactifications are based on the preprint of Kuperberg and Thurston [20] (though we provide slightly more details), so this Section will be a review for readers familiar with that work.

3.1. **Configuration spaces.** In general, for a space X, let $C_q(X)$ be the space of distinct ordered q-tuples in X, the (uncompactified, or open) *configuration space* of points in X labeled by $1, ...q$. We will only consider the case when $X = M$, a manifold, often Euclidean space. We ultimately want to perform integration (and an appropriate analogue of it) over such configuration spaces, so we need to replace them by compact versions. We will define compact spaces $C_\Gamma[M]$ of configurations of points in M labeled by the vertices of Γ, where Γ is a ≥ 3-valent graph as in Section 2. The graph Γ may be oriented as in Definition 2.6, but this *compactified configuration space* $C_\Gamma[M]$ will depend on only the underlying unoriented graph of Γ. Moreover it will depend only on the underlying trivalent graph $T(\Gamma)$, where edges and arcs are not distinguished from each other.

Throughout, we will use the letters i, j (etc.) for labels on vertices of Γ and x_i, x_j (etc.) for the corresponding points in M. We would like to blowup the diagonal $x_i = x_j$ in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ for every pair $i \neq j$ of distinct endpoints of an edge or arc in Γ. This is not possible unless we blow up diagonals of lower dimension. For example, suppose we wanted to blow up $\mathbb{R}^3$ along the planes $x = y$, $y = z$, and $x = z$. The simultaneous blowup along all three planes is ill defined because their intersection is not transverse. However, if we first blow up the line $x = y = z$, we may then blow up the (images of the) three planes in any order and obtain the same result, regardless of the order of these three blowups. (On the other hand, if we wanted to blow up only the planes $x = y$ and $y = z$, we could do this without blowing up the line $x = y = z$ first.)

One solution is to blow up all the diagonals in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$, in increasing order of dimension. This gives the "canonical" Axelrod–Singer/Fulton–MacPherson compactification, used by Bott and Taubes. It is however possible to blow up fewer diagonals and still blow up all the diagonals corresponding to edges of Γ (in any order). This was the approach taken by Kuperberg and Thurston, which we will follow.

3.2. **Compactification.** For a subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$, let $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ denote the subset of $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ where all the vertices of Γ' have collided, i.e.,

$$\Delta_{\Gamma'} := \{f \in M^{V(\Gamma)} : f(x_i) = f(x_j)\ \forall i, j \in V(\Gamma')\}.$$

We will now blow up $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ along the diagonal $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ for every biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$. We will perform these blowups in the following order. First, blow up all such diagonals which are minimal with respect to inclusion (in any order). Then blow up the remaining minimal diagonals (in any order), and so on, until all the 2-fold diagonals corresponding to edges and arcs of Γ are blown up. We need to check that this is well defined; in other words, we must show that the diagonals which we blow up simultaneously are mutually transverse.

Proposition 3.1. *The diagonals corresponding to the blocks of Γ intersect transversely.*

Proof. In the case $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, all the diagonals are just linear subspaces, so it suffices to check that the codimension of their intersection is the sum of their codimensions. For general M, this also suffices because a neighborhood of a diagonal in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ is modeled by a neighborhood of a diagonal in Euclidean space. Let $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_j$ denote the blocks of Γ, let $n_i = |V(\Gamma_i)|$, and let $n = |V(\Gamma)|$. The intersection of all the Δ_{Γ_i} is just Δ_Γ, which has codimension $(n-1)d$. Each Δ_{Γ_i} has codimension $(n_i - 1)d$. So it suffices to check that $\sum_{i=1}^{j}(n_i - 1) = n - 1$. Since $\Upsilon(\Gamma)$ is a tree, $|V(\Upsilon(\Gamma))| - |E(\Upsilon(\Gamma))| = 1$. Letting $e = |E(\Upsilon(\Gamma))|$, we rewrite this as $j - e = 1$, and thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j}(n_i - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{j} n_i - j = (n + e) - j = n - (j - e) = n - 1$$

where Lemma 2.4 justifies the second equality. □

The upshot of the above Proposition is that we can simultaneously blow up all the minimal diagonals corresponding to blocks of Γ. Having done this, we now want to blow up the remaining diagonals, starting with those minimal among the remaining diagonals. (Again, we cannot merely blow up the 2-fold diagonals because they may still not be mutually transverse.) We check that these remaining minimal diagonals are mutually transverse.

Proposition 3.2. *The minimal diagonals remaining after blowing up the original collection of minimal diagonals are mutually transverse.*

Proof. Let Γ_i, Γ_j be subgraphs corresponding to such minimal diagonals. There are three possibilities:

(1) $\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_j = \varnothing$.
(2) Γ_i and Γ_j intersect in one vertex.
(3) Γ_i and Γ_j intersect in more than one vertex.

Now consider the intersection of diagonals associated to $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k$. Suppose some pair Γ_i, Γ_j satisfy (3) above. Then their union forms a larger biconnected subgraph Γ'. In this case Δ_{Γ_1} and Δ_{Γ_2} do not intersect because $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ has already been blown up. Thus the intersection of the diagonals associated to $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k$ is empty, hence they are transverse.

So we may now assume that every pair Γ_i, Γ_j satisfies (1) or (2) above. Such a collection of Γ_i forms a forest $\mathcal{F}$, in the same way that the maximal biconnected Γ_i formed a tree $\Upsilon(\Gamma)$ in the first step. For each tree (component) of $\mathcal{F}$, the diagonals associated to the Γ_i in that component intersect transversely, by the same dimension-counting argument as in the first step. This reduces the argument to checking transversality of a collection of diagonals in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ which correspond to pairwise disjoint subsets of $V(\Gamma)$. But this transversality is clear. □

Applying the above proposition inductively makes the following definition meaningful.

Definitions 3.3. Let M be a compact manifold.

(1) Define $C_\Gamma[M]$ as the result of blowing up $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ along $\Delta_{\Gamma'}$ for every biconnected $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$, in increasing order of inclusion (i.e., starting with the lowest-dimensional diagonals, or the diagonals with the collisions of the most points). Let $C_\Gamma(M)$ denote the interior of $C_\Gamma[M]$.
(2) Define $C_n[M]$ as $C_{K_n}[M]$, where K_n is the complete graph on n vertices (with $L = \varnothing$).

The space $C_n[M]$ is precisely the Axelrod–Singer compactification, used by Bott and Taubes in [4] and Cattaneo et al in [7]. In $C_n[M]$, a collision of any two points is accompanied by the datum of a direction of collision, and a collision of any three points is further accompanied by the datum of a relative rate of approach ($|x_i - x_j|/|x_j - x_k|$) (see for example the work of Sinha [29]).

As a blowup, $C_\Gamma[M]$ is a manifold with corners, which one can thus integrate over. Notice that there is a blow-down map

$$C_\Gamma[M] \to M^{V(\Gamma)}.$$

Remark 3.4 (Slight abuse of terminology)**.** Since we didn't blow up every diagonal in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$ to get $C_\Gamma[M]$, a point in the interior of $C_\Gamma[M]$ is a tuple of points in M that need not be pairwise distinct. Nonetheless, we will sometimes refer to such a tuple as a *configuration*.

3.2.1. *A slight modification when M is Euclidean space.* For the case $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, which we are primarily interested in, we will also record directions of approach of any point in Γ to infinity, as follows. Let $\Sigma\Gamma$ denote the *suspension* of Γ, meaning the graph obtained from Γ by adding an extra vertex and an edge between this extra vertex and every vertex of Γ. View S^d as the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 3.5. Define $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ as the subset of $C_{\Sigma\Gamma}[S^d]$ where the extra vertex is fixed at $\infty \in S^d$.

That is, $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ is defined as the subset of points in $C_{\Sigma\Gamma}[S^d]$ which blow down to $(x_1, ..., x_{|V(\Gamma)|}, \infty) \in (S^d)^{V(\Sigma\Gamma)}$ for some $x_i \in S^d$. It is easy to see that a biconnected subgraph of $\Sigma\Gamma$ is precisely either a biconnected subgraph of Γ or the "suspension" of a connected subgraph of Γ by the extra vertex ∞. Thus we have defined $C_\Gamma[M]$ when M is either compact or Euclidean space.

Remark 3.6 (Relationships to other compactifications)**.** (1) In our work with Munson and Volić, we also considered spaces obtained by blowing up only some of the diagonals in the cartesian product [18, Section 4.2.4]. That construction is however somewhat different from the one we will use below. The construction in [18] involves altering Γ into a "hybrid" with "graft components" for the purpose of working with homotopy links (i.e. link maps) rather than links (i.e. embeddings). Here we work only with embeddings, so the hybrid is not needed. Also, in [18], every diagonal in each "graft component" is blown up, whereas we blow up even fewer diagonals here. (2) The compactification used by Poirier [25] appears to be closer to the Kuperberg–Thurston compactification that we will use below. It is defined differently from the latter compactification but seems to share the feature of blowing up only those 2-fold diagonals corresponding to edges in Γ.

Remark 3.7. Notice that the canonical compactification $C_{|V(\Gamma)|}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ can be obtained from $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ by merely blowing up (in increasing order of dimension) the images of all the diagonals which have not already been blown up. There is then a blow-down map $C_{|V(\Gamma)|}[\mathbb{R}^d] \to C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$.

3.3. **The corners of the compactified configuration spaces.** We review and elaborate on some details regarding the corner structure from Section 4.3 of [20]. These details will be useful for degeneracy arguments, where we consider the images of various faces under the spherical maps, in Lemma 5.16. In that Lemma, we need to consider only codimension-1 faces. Nonetheless, we provide descriptions of general corners, for the reader's edification. A face of codimension k is indexed by a set of subgraphs $S = \{\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k\}$ of Γ, where each Γ_i is a biconnected graph (on at least two vertices). This set S indexes a face which is the intersection of the closures of all of the codimension-1 faces indexed by $\{\Gamma_1\}, ..., \{\Gamma_k\}$. Conversely, a set $S = \{\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k\}$ indexes a face whenever the intersection of the codimension-1 faces indexed by $\{\Gamma_1\}, ..., \{\Gamma_k\}$ is nonempty. More explicitly, such a set S indexes a face if for each pair $\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j \in S$ one of the following holds:

- $\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_j = \varnothing$,
- one subgraph is contained in the other,
- or Γ_i and Γ_j intersect in one vertex.

Faces indexed by S and S' intersect precisely when the union $S \cup S'$ is a set of the form above. In that case, $S \cup S'$ is the indexing set of the intersection.

Suppose M is a d-dimensional manifold (or even just $\mathbb{R}^d$). Then a point in a stratum indexed by $S = \{\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k\}$ can be described by a configuration of ℓ points in M, plus certain *screens* which may be thought of as infinitesimal configurations. Here ℓ is the number of vertices in the graph obtained by identifying all the vertices in each subgraph that is maximal among $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k$; notice that if Γ_i, Γ_j are such maximal subgraphs which intersect, but so that neither is contained in the other, then all the vertices in these two subgraphs are identified to a single point. A *screen* is a configuration in a tangent space to M modulo translation and positive scaling, i.e., a point in some $C_n(T_pM)/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+)$, which we call a *screen space*. In the stratum indexed by $S = \{\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k\}$, there is a screen for each Γ_i. The number of points n in the screen corresponding to Γ_i is at most the number of vertices in the graph obtained from Γ_i by identifying all the vertices in each graph among $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k$ that is a maximal proper subgraph of Γ_i; there may be fewer points if some of these points have collided in As when we calculated the number ℓ just above, multiple graphs Γ_i may be identified to a point when calculating the number of points in each screen. The reader may calculate in some simple examples that the codimension of a face indexed by $\{\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_k\}$ is indeed k, by adding the dimensions of the relevant screen spaces and configuration space of ℓ points.

We partition the codimension-1 faces of $C_\Gamma[M]$ into three types, using standard terminology:

Definition 3.8.

- A *principal face* is a face obtained by blowing up a 2-fold diagonal in $M^{V(\Gamma)}$. In the case of $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, where $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \subset C_{\Sigma\Gamma}[S^d]$, the principal faces are those obtained by blowing up any diagonal involving 2 of the first $|V(\Gamma)|$ points.
- For $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, a *face at infinity* is a face where one or more points have collided with $\infty \in S^d$.
- The remaining codimension-1 faces are called *hidden faces*. These are faces involving a collision of more than two points (none of which is ∞, if $M = \mathbb{R}^d$).

Note that sometimes the term "hidden face" is used to describe any face that is not a principal face, in which case faces at infinity are considered to be a special type of hidden face.

Each type of codimension-1 face corresponds to a certain type of subgraph of Γ:

- each principal face corresponds to an edge of Γ,
- each face at infinity corresponds to a biconnected subgraph of $\Sigma\Gamma$ containing the vertex ∞, or equivalently, to a connected subgraph of Γ,
- and each hidden face corresponds to a biconnected subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ with $|V(\Gamma')| > 2$.

4. Bundles over spaces of links and resulting real cohomology classes

We now use the compactification from Section 3 to construct bundles over spaces of links (Section 4.1) and pull back spherical cohomology classes (Section 4.2). We then fiberwise integrate differential forms (Section 4.3) and recall why this produces a cohomology class out of any graph cocycle (Section 4.4). The purpose of this detour into de Rham cohomology (which is not used in our main construction) is to connect our main construction to previous results. In particular, we need the nontriviality of the resulting cohomology classes (Theorem 4.5). This Section will be mostly familiar material to readers acquainted with the work of Cattaneo et al [7] (or of Bott and Taubes [4] or of Munson, Volic, and the author [18]). Our choice of the Kuperberg–Thurston compactification from Section 3 (which is "smaller" than the canonical Fulton–Macpherson/Axelrod–Singer compactification) is the only new twist, but Lemma 4.3 ensures that this causes no difficulties.

4.1. **A fiber bundle over the space of links.** We now build a fiber bundle over the space of links using the compactified configuration spaces $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ described above. It will be clear that the bundle depends on the full data in the underlying unoriented graph Γ on L, rather than just $T(\Gamma)$. (The orientation on Γ will be used later, in defining integrals over these bundles.)

We need a suitable compactified configuration space of points in the 1-manifold L.

Definitions 4.1. Suppose $L \neq \varnothing$, and let Γ be a graph on the 1-manifold L.

- Let $s(\Gamma)$ be the subdiagram of Γ of the segment vertices and all edges and arcs between them.

Let $\mathrm{Map}_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ be the space of maps $V(s(\Gamma)) \to L$ which respect the components that the vertices lie on and the order of the vertices on these components. (The order is determined by the orientation on L.) Let $C^o_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ be the result of blowing up the diagonal for every biconnected subgraph of $s(\Gamma)$, in increasing order of inclusion as in Definition 3.3. Finally fix any smooth embedding e of L into some $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 3$, such that e is affine-linear outside a compact subset and such that the directions of approach to infinity of the $2m$ rays of L are pairwise distinct.

- Define $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$ as the closure of the image of the map $C^o_{s(\Gamma)}[L] \to C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ induced by e.

A key feature of the compact space $C_{s(\Gamma)})[L]$ is that it not only includes limit points at infinity, but also records relative rates of approach of points to infinity. Any two choices for e will yield diffeomorphic spaces $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$. This space is very similar to one that we defined and elaborated on in [18]. Note that if L is closed, then Definition 4.1 agrees with Definition 3.3 with $M = L$, and that if $L = \mathbb{R}$, then Definition 4.1 agrees with Definition 3.5 with $d = 1$.

Now consider the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X[\Gamma] & \longrightarrow & C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{L}^d_m \times C_{s(\Gamma)}[L] & \longrightarrow & C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d] \end{array} \tag{3}$$

We claim that there is a well defined projection map $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \to C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ as shown in the right-hand column above. In fact, a connected (respectively biconnected) subgraph of $s(\Gamma)$ is necessarily a connected (respectively biconnected) subgraph of Γ. Thus under the projection of the cartesian products $(S^d)^{V(\Sigma\Gamma)} \to (S^d)^{V(\Sigma(s(\Gamma)))}$, the preimage of every diagonal that is blown up to construct $C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ is blown up in constructing $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$. Hence we get the desired projection.

The lower horizontal map comes from the fact that an embedding $(f : L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d) \in \mathcal{L}^d_m$ induces for any Γ a map of compactifications $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L] \hookrightarrow C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$.

For each Γ, we will consider the bundle $p : X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$, where p is given by the left-hand vertical map above followed by the projection to $\mathcal{L}^d_m$.

Let $F[\Gamma]$ denote the fiber of this bundle, say over a link $f : L \to \mathbb{R}^d$. Its dimension is lower than that of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$, since some points are constrained to lie in the image of f. Nonetheless its corner structure is the same as that of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$. That is, the faces of $F[\Gamma]$ are in one-to-one correspondence with those of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$, and this correspondence preserves codimension. Thus $F[\Gamma]$ (or alternately $X[\Gamma]$) has principal faces, faces at infinity, and hidden faces corresponding precisely to those of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$.

Remark 4.2. This bundle is similar to the one used by Bott and Taubes and Cattaneo et al. In fact, a pullback square similar (3) but with $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$, $C_{s(\Gamma)}[L]$, and $C_{s(\Gamma)}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ replaced by $C_{|V(\Gamma)|}[\mathbb{R}^d]$,

$C_{|V_{seg}(\Gamma)|}[L]$, and $C_{|V_{seg}(\Gamma)|}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ respectively produces their bundle. Their depends only on the numbers of segment vertices (say $q_1 + ... + q_m$) and free vertices (say t) rather than all the data in the graph Γ. Call the total space of this bundle $X[q_1, ..., q_m; t]$ and call its fiber $F[q_1, ..., q_m; t]$.[a]

4.2. **Spherical maps.** To define classes in $H^*(X[\Gamma])$, we will use the orientation on Γ.

For every edge in Γ with endpoints $i \neq j$, we consider the map φ_{ij} defined by the composition

$$\varphi_{ij} : X[\Gamma] \to C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \to S^{d-1}$$

where the second map is given on the interior by

$$(x_1, x_2, ...) \mapsto \frac{x_i - x_j}{|x_i - x_j|}.$$

This map is well defined because we have blown up the 2-fold diagonal $x_i = x_j$ for every edge with endpoints $\{i, j\}$ when constructing $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$.

For a self-loop on a segment vertex i, consider the map

$$\varphi_{ii} : X[\Gamma] \to S^{d-1}$$

given by the unit tangent vector to L at the point x_i.

If d is odd, define

$$\Phi = \Phi_\Gamma := \prod \varphi_{ij} : X[\Gamma] \to \prod S^{d-1} \tag{4}$$

where both products are taken over all edges $(i \to j)$ (including self-loops $(i \to i)$) in Γ, and where the order of factors in the product is chosen arbitrarily. If d is even, define Φ similarly, by arbitrarily choosing either φ_{ij} or φ_{ji} for each edge between vertices i and j, but ordering the factors according to the order of the edges. We will call Φ the *spherical map*.

4.3. **Fiberwise integrals.** Although singular cohomology is more the spirit of this paper than de Rham cohomology, we will now consider integration of forms in order to connect our results to the previously found Bott–Taubes/Vassiliev $\mathbb{R}$-valued cohomology classes.

Let ω denote the volume form on S^{d-1}. For each edge of Γ with endpoints i, j let $\theta_{ij} = \varphi_{ij}^* \omega \in \Omega^{d-1}_{dR}(X[\Gamma])$. For brevity, we will sometimes write $\alpha := \prod \theta_{ij}$. As above, this product is taken over all edges of Γ, where the labeling of Γ determines (only) the order of the indices i, j if d is odd and (only) the order of the factors in the product if d is even. In either case, this uniquely determines α, regardless of the remaining arbitrary choices.

We consider the integral I_Γ over the fiber of the bundle $F[\Gamma] \to X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$, defined by

$$I_\Gamma := \int_{F[\Gamma]} \alpha = \int_{F[\Gamma]} \prod \theta_{ij},$$

which is a differential form on $\mathcal{L}^d_m$.

We will first note that this integral over our bundle X_Γ agrees with the corresponding integral over the slightly different original Bott–Taubes bundle $X[q_1, ..., q_m; t]$ (see Remark 4.2 for its definition). In fact, one can easily define a form on $X[q_1, ..., q_m; t]$ similar to the form α on $X[\Gamma]$. We will use the same notation for both forms. To compare the fiberwise integrals of α over these two bundles, recall that $C_{q_1+...+q_m+t}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ is obtained by merely blowing up subsets of the boundary of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$. Thus the integrals of α over $F[q_1, ..., q_m; t]$ and $F[\Gamma]$ agree on complements of arbitrarily small neighborhoods of the boundary:

Lemma 4.3. *The integrals*

$$\int_{F[q_1,...,q_m;t]} \theta_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \theta_{i_k j_k} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_{F[\Gamma]} \theta_{i_1 j_1} \cdots \theta_{i_k j_k}$$

[a]In our previous work, we called such a pullback $E[q_1, ..., q_m; t]$. In this article we use X instead of E to avoid overloading notation. Other authors use various other notations for this total space.

along the fibers of the bundles

$$F[q_1,...,q_m;t] \to X[q_1,...,q_m;t] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m \qquad \textit{and} \qquad F[\Gamma] \to X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$$

agree. □

Thus we may refer to either integral as I_Γ.

4.4. **Real cohomology classes from graph cocycles.** We next review the arguments for the construction of nontrivial cohomology classes over $\mathbb{R}$ by integration of forms. Although we discuss the integrals over $F[\Gamma]$, the arguments used in previous literature for integrals over $F[q_1,...,q_m;t]$ apply with minimal modification, as suggested by Lemma 4.3. We will give a topological reinterpretation of these arguments in Section 5, in detail, so our treatment here is brief.

The forms that are integrated along the fiber are sums of products of the θ_{ij}. One wants to produce cohomology classes, so one needs to produce closed forms. Since the fiber $F = F[\Gamma]$ has nonempty boundary, Stokes' Theorem implies that

$$d\int_F \alpha = \int_F \cancelto{0}{d\alpha} \pm \int_{\partial F} \alpha|_{\partial E}$$

Thus the key is to show that, for certain sums of products of θ_{ij}, the integral along the boundary $\int_{\partial F} \alpha|_{\partial E}$ is zero.

Since the corner structure of $F[\Gamma]$ comes from that of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$, $F[\Gamma]$ has codimension-1 faces corresponding to those defined in Definition 3.8 (though the dimension of some of these faces is lower in $F[\Gamma]$ because some points are constrained to lie on the link). If we let the link in the base space $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ vary, we can alternately think of these faces as faces of the fiber $F[\Gamma]$ and faces of the total space $X = X[\Gamma]$. The arguments for the vanishing along boundary faces differs depending on the type of the face.

Remark 4.4. For $d \geq 4$, the vanishing arguments for integrals along these types of faces are respectively as follows:

- The integrals along principal faces do not vanish. Instead, choosing appropriate linear combinations of integrals ensures that these contributions cancel. We can call this reason for vanishing *cancellation*.
- The integrals along a face at infinity vanish because of *degeneracy*: the image of this face under the map Φ defined in (4) has positive codimension.
- For certain hidden faces, one can argue vanishing by *degeneracy*. For the remaining hidden faces, one argues the vanishing by *symmetry*. In more detail, If one views the integral as an iterated integral in a certain order, one is at some point integrating over a space with an involution which either preserves the form and reverses the orientation, or multiplies the form by -1 and preserves the orientation. Thus the integral is equal to its own negative and must vanish.

Thus the problem of constructing closed forms is reduced to the problem of finding those linear combinations of integrals $\sum_i c_i I_{\Gamma_i}$ for which the principal face contributions cancel. Via the association $\Gamma \mapsto I_\Gamma$ of configuration space integrals to graphs, one can rephrase this problem in terms of the graph complex defined in Section 2.3. Part (1) of the following theorem implies that the linear combinations of integrals which are closed forms correspond exactly to those $\sum c_i\Gamma_i$ in the graph complex which are cocycles.

Theorem 4.5 ([7, 18])**.**

(1) *The association* $\Gamma \to I_\Gamma$ *is a chain map*

$$I : \bigoplus_{k,n} \mathcal{D}^k_n \to \Omega^*_{dR}(\mathcal{L}^d_m) \tag{5}$$

from the cochain complex of graphs to the de Rham cochain complex on the space of knots $\mathcal{L}^d_m$, provided $d \geq 4$. It sends a cochain in $\mathcal{D}^k_n$ to a de Rham cochain of degree $n(d-3)+k$.

(2) *For defect $k = 0$, the integration map I induces an injection in cohomology, producing a nontrivial cohomology class in $H^{n(d-3)}(\mathcal{L}^d_m)$ for each nontrivial cocycle in $\mathcal{D}^0_n$.*

An analogue of statement (1) was established in [7] for the case of closed knots $m = 1$. The case of long links was treated in [18]. (The case of closed links can also be covered by all the arguments in [18].) Notice that since the coboundary map raises the defect by 1, the space of defect-0 cocycles is equal to the space of defect-0 cohomology classes. Part (2) was proven in [7] for closed knots, and the proof there can be easily generalized to links (long or closed).

While integration I is not a chain map for $d = 3$, this deficiency can be corrected by adding "anomaly terms." In that case, the injectivity result holds, and in fact, integration then gives an isomorphism [31, 35, 18] between the space $Z(\mathcal{D}^0_n)$ of defect-0, order-n cocycles and the space of all finite-type knot or link invariants of type n (studied by Vassiliev [34] and others). The former space is the space of (uni)trivalent graph cocycles, and this isomorphism is sometimes called the Fundamental Theorem of Finite-Type Invariants. Theorem 4.5 is thus an extension of that theorem on knot and link invariants to cohomology classes of higher degree. Moreover, work of Bar-Natan [1] implies that the cohomology of defect-0 graphs $Z(\mathcal{D}^0_*)$ has many nontrivial elements. Thus Theorem 4.5 gives the existence of many nontrivial cohomology classes in embedding spaces.

Example 4.6. The simplest nontrivial example for odd d, illustrates the above Theorem. Consider $L = \mathbb{R}$, and define

$\gamma_2^{\text{odd}} :=$

(6)

An analogue of this cocycle (with S^1 instead of $\mathbb{R}$ and with coefficients related to symmetries of the circular versions of these graphs) features prominently in the original work of Bott and Taubes. One can show that γ_2^{odd} is a cocycle, since the contraction of each of the four arcs of the circle in the first graph produces the same graph as the contraction of each of the three edges in the second graph. The associated integral

$$I(\gamma_2^{\text{odd}}) = \frac{1}{4}\int_{F[4;0]} \theta_{13}\theta_{24} - \frac{1}{3}\int_{F[3;1]} \theta_{14}\theta_{24}\theta_{34} \tag{7}$$

is an invariant of long knots (which is finite-type of order, or type, 2). Note that since the underlying trivalent graphs of both graphs (after compactifying at infinity) are complete graphs, the compactified configuration space fibers $F[\Gamma_i]$ are in fact the Axelrod–Singer compactifications. That is, the distinction between their compactification and the one we use (see Remark 4.2) does not exist here. When $d = 3$, the above integral expression (7) gives the type-2 invariant of knots. There is a similar cocycle of order 2 for even d:

$\gamma_2^{\text{even}} :=$

(8)

5. Gluing configuration spaces

We now provide a recipe for associating to a graph cocycle γ a space obtained by gluing together configuration spaces. We will glue together the bundles $X[\Gamma_i]$ for the various graphs Γ_i in the

cocycle γ. This will be a fiberwise construction, meaning that we fix a link L in the base space $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ and then glue together the various fibers $F[\Gamma_i]$ over L to produce a space F_γ for each L. The space F_γ will have a fundamental class, relative to ∂F_γ. Thus allowing the link L to vary yields a bundle X_γ over $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ whose fiber has a fundamental class, relative to its boundary. The gluing will be done so that the space X_γ will have a map Φ_γ to (roughly) a product of $(d-1)$-spheres. The image under Φ_γ of the remaining boundary $\partial X_\gamma \subset F_\gamma$ will have positive codimension, so this boundary can be thought of as the "degenerate locus." This will allow us to pull back the top-dimensional cohomology class on the product of spheres and use the fundamental class $[F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma]$ to produce a cohomology class in $\mathcal{L}^d_m$. The resulting class will correspond to the fiberwise integral of the product of spherical forms.

In Section 5.1, we consider integer-valued cocycles $\sum c_i\Gamma_i$, which are the input for our construction. We also discuss how to associate to such a cocycle a disjoint union of oriented configuration spaces $X[\Gamma_i]$. Then in Section 5.2 we glue the $X[\Gamma_i]$ along their principal faces. This is the most involved part of the construction, mainly because of careful accounting of orientations in arbitrary cocycles. After gluing, it remains to fold (Section 5.4) and collapse (Section 5.5) some faces. At each of these steps, we observe that the space has a fundamental class relative to the remaining boundary faces. We will then work relative to these faces, which are listed in Section 5.7. Finally, in Section 5.8 we establish the appropriate map to a product of spheres.

5.1. **An integral graph complex.** Although the graph complex considered in [7] is defined over the real numbers, it is easy to see that one can define it equally well over $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Z}/p$, or any ring R. We will first restrict our attention to $R = \mathbb{Z}$. A cocycle γ over $\mathbb{Z}$ of defect k and order n can be represented by a finite linear combination of oriented diagrams Γ_i (see Definition 2.6):

$$\gamma = \sum c_i\Gamma_i$$

Note that the space of cocycles over $\mathbb{R}$ is just the tensor product of the space of cocycles over $\mathbb{Z}$ with $\mathbb{R}$; that is, these spaces are free modules of the same rank. In defect zero, there are no coboundaries, so the space of cocycles is precisely the cohomology. (Of course in general defect k, the universal coefficient theorem applies to show that the cohomology over $\mathbb{R}$ has the same dimension as the rank of the cohomology over $\mathbb{Z}$, though the cohomology over $\mathbb{Z}$ may also have torsion summands.)

5.1.1. *Minimal cocycles.* Consider a cocycle $\gamma = \sum c_i\Gamma_i$ in $\mathcal{D}$ with $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Because $\mathcal{D}$ is a quotient by orientation relations, there are multiple such expressions $\sum c_i\Gamma_i$ which represent γ.

Definitions 5.1. For an integral cocycle γ, call a representative expression $\sum c_i\Gamma_i$ *simplified* if the underlying unoriented graphs $|\Gamma_i|$ are in distinct isomorphism classes, and if none of the Γ_i is 0 in $\mathcal{D}$. Define S_γ, the *support* of γ, as the set of unoriented isomorphism classes which appear in a simplified expression for γ:

$$S_\gamma := \{|\Gamma_i| : c_i \neq 0\}.$$

Call a cocycle γ *minimal* if there is no cocycle β for which S_β is a nonempty proper subset of S_γ, and if there is no cocycle β such that $\gamma = c\beta$ for some c with $|c| > 1$.

Any expression for a cocycle γ can be turned into a simplified one, by possibly relabeling the Γ_i (and adding minus signs if necessary) and then combining like terms. Thus S_γ is always defined, and it does not depend on the choice of simplified expression for γ. Note that in a simplified expression, no Γ_i has a multiple edge or an orientation-reversing automorphism. Since any cocycle can be decomposed into a sum of minimal cocycles, we may as well restrict our attention to minimal cocycles. Then after constructing cohomology classes for all minimal γ, we can take the cohomology class associated to an arbitrary cocycle to be the linear combination of classes associated to the minimal cocycles in a decomposition of γ.

5.1.2. *The configuration spaces to be glued.* Fix a minimal integer-valued cocycle γ. Let N be the maximum number of edges over all the Γ_i in S_γ. (Recall that we do not count arcs as edges.) Following terminology of Poirier [25], we let $a_i := N - |E(\Gamma_i)|$ be the number of "absent edges" in Γ_i. Our first step in constructing the glued space F_γ is to start with $|c_i|$ disjoint copies of $X[\Gamma_i] \times (S^{d-1})^{a_i}$ for each i. Often we will abbreviate $X[\Gamma_i] \times (S^{d-1})^{a_i} =: \widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$.

By fixing an orientation on $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, we determine for all i an orientation on $M^{V(\Gamma_i)}$. This determines an orientation on $C_{\Gamma_i}[\mathbb{R}^d]$, hence on the fibers $F[\Gamma_i]$ of the bundle $X[\Gamma_i] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$. Fixing an orientation on S^{d-1} then determines an orientation of $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i] := F[\Gamma_i] \times (S^{d-1})^{a_i}$. (Note that for d odd, changing the order of factors of S^{d-1} will not change the orientation.) If $c_i > 0$, take this orientation on the fibers of (all the copies of) $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$, while if $c_i < 0$, take the opposite of this orientation. The fiber F_γ of the glued space will be a quotient of this disjoint union of oriented manifolds with corners. Note that there is an obvious bijection between the faces and corners of $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$ and those of $X[\Gamma_i]$.

5.2. **Gluing configuration spaces along principal faces.** In this Section, we glue the configuration space bundles along their principal faces. We do this in three steps. First, we consistently orient all the graphs in a cocycle γ. Then we check that the principal faces whose contributions in $d\gamma$ cancel can in fact be identified. Finally, we check that we can pairwise glue all of these faces so that every identification is orientation-reversing for odd d.

5.2.1. *Consistently oriented expressions for a cocycle.* Note that even a simplified expression for a cocycle γ is not unique, due to all the possible labelings of the Γ_i. Even the orientation class of a labeling is not determined: if $\overline{\Gamma_i}$ stands for Γ_i with the reversed orientation, then Γ_i and $-\overline{\Gamma_i}$ are the same element in $\mathcal{D}^k_n$. The following notion is useful for checking that the glued space F_γ has a fundamental cycle and a well defined spherical map. Recall that in the coboundary $d\gamma = \sum c_i d\Gamma_i$, each term $d\Gamma_i$ is a signed sum of graphs Γ_i/e that are contractions of Γ_i along an edge or arc e.

Definition 5.2. Call a simplified expression $\sum_i c_i\Gamma_i$ representing a cocycle γ (or the associated set of graphs $\{\Gamma_i\}_i$) *consistently oriented* if $|\Gamma_i/e| \cong |\Gamma_j/f|$ implies that $\varepsilon(e) = \varepsilon(f)$ and that $\Gamma_i/e \sim \Gamma_j/f$ as oriented graphs.

Lemma 5.3. *A minimal cocycle γ has a consistently oriented expression, unique up to reversing the orientations on all the graphs.*

Proof. Fix any simplified expression $\sum_i c_i\Gamma_i$ for γ, and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of (unoriented) isomorphism classes of the Γ_i/e in $d\gamma$ which have no multiple edges and no orientation-reversing automorphisms. We will view an element $P \in \mathcal{P}$ as the set of contracted graphs in $d\gamma$ in a fixed isomorphism class.

Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and fix one (labeled) Γ_i which has a quotient Γ_i/e in P. Now consider any other Γ_j/f in P. First fix an isomorphism $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$. For odd d, we can use this isomorphism and the labeling on Γ_i to determine a (possibly new) labeling on Γ_j, up to possibly reversing the orientation of f *and* switching the labels on the endpoints of f.[b] Thus they determine an orientation on Γ_j, and clearly this orientation will satisfy the consistency conditions for this pair of graphs. For even d, a labeling of Γ_j is completely determined, unless e (respectively f) is an arc, in which case there is a non-canonical choice of the label on f (respectively a segment-vertex label j); but either way, this choice can be made so that $\varepsilon(e) = \varepsilon(f)$; cf. formulae (1) and (2) in Section 2.3. Thus an orientation on Γ_j is determined, and its independence of the choice of isomorphism (and of the choice of f if multiple different edge contractions give the same graph) is guaranteed by the absence of orientation-reversing automorphisms of P. Now equip Γ_j with this orientation, changing the sign

[b] If f is an arc, the orientation on L precludes this possibility.



FIGURE 1. The diagrams in the top row are consistently oriented. In each diagram, the contraction of the arc or edge from 2 to 3 produces the diagram in the bottom row, with precisely those labels and arrows. (The arc from 2 to 3 in the left-hand diagram is oriented from left to right, by convention.) In the bottom diagram, the "infinitesimal" edge $(2,3)$ corresponds to the screen of the two points which have collided. Changing either diagram by an even permutation of vertex labels or an even number of edge reversals would still give a pair of consistently oriented diagrams. Similarly, so would changing the orientation on both diagrams. (The diagrams in the top row appear in the graph cocycle of defect 0 and order 3 [7, Sec. 5.1, Fig. 3].)

of c_j if this orientation differs from the original one on Γ_j. This determines orientations on all the graphs with quotients in P and leaves us with the same cocycle $\gamma \in \mathcal{D}_n^k$.

We repeat this process for another class P, starting with a graph whose orientation we have already determined. Notice that there is such a graph because γ is minimal. Notice also that we will never contradict the previously determined orientations, for if we do, then some graph would have an orientation-reversing automorphism, contradicting the definition of $\mathcal{P}$. For the Γ_i/e in $d\gamma$ which *do* have orientation-reversing automorphisms, the consistency condition is trivial since either quotient graph is 0. Continuing for all classes P, we determine consistent orientations on all the Γ_i; for each i we have possibly changed both the orientation of Γ_i and the sign of c_i, but we have not changed the cocycle γ. See Figure 1 below. The only choice of orientation we made was of the initial Γ_i in this process. □

5.2.2. *Gluing a pair of faces.* Now consider the space $\coprod c_i \widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ associated to a consistently oriented expression for γ. An edge or arc e of a Γ_i or, more suggestively, the contracted graph Γ_i/e, corresponds to a principal face of $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$, which we will denote $\mathfrak{S}(e)$. By this correspondence, we can view $d\gamma$ as a disjoint union of principal faces of the $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ (or $-\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ in the case of negative c_i), which we now want to glue in pairs.

Lemma 5.4.

(1) *An isomorphism $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ determines a diffeomorphism of the interiors of the corresponding principal faces $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(f)$, which is canonical up to (a) permuting factors of S^{d-1} and (b) transposing the corresponding pair of points in the configuration space.*
(2) *Suppose an isomorphism $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ is orientation-preserving and that $\varepsilon(e) = \varepsilon(f)$. Then for d odd, we can take the associated diffeomorphism g to be orientation-preserving, in which case the spherical maps Φ_{Γ_i} and $\Phi_{\Gamma_j} \circ g$ agree up to permuting S^{d-1} factors in the codomain and up to antipodal maps on an* even *number of these factors (i.e., by an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism of the codomain).*

Proof. We first prove statement (1). An interior point of either $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(f)$ is given by a configuration of points in $\Gamma_i/e \cong \Gamma_j/f$ together with a direction of collision of two points. For either space, there are two cases for this direction of collision:

(i) If the endpoints of e (respectively f) are both segment vertices, then this direction which is part of the data of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ (respectively $\mathfrak{S}(f)$) is a direction in $\mathbb{R}$, i.e., a point in S^0, which is automatically determined by the orientation of the segment and the order of vertices on the segment.
(ii) Otherwise, it is a direction in $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., a vector in S^{d-1}.

The numbers a_i and a_j of absent edges in Γ_i and Γ_j agree precisely when the directions of collision for $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(f)$ are vectors in the same space, i.e., either both are case (i) or both are case (ii). The only other possibility is that a_i and a_j differ by 1. In that case (without loss of generality) $a_i = a_j + 1$, and the collision in Γ_i is of two segment vertices (no direction to specify), while in Γ_j it is a collision of a free vertex with a segment vertex (direction in S^{d-1}). Thus the extra factor of S^{d-1} in $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ corresponds to the extra direction of collision in $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_j]$. Thus the interiors of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(f)$ are indeed diffeomorphic. This diffeomorphism is clearly canonical, up to a choice of which factors of S^{d-1} to map between, and up to choices of whether to use $x_i - x_j$ or $x_j - x_i$ as the direction of collision between x_i and x_j. In at least one of the graphs, e or f is an edge rather than an arc, so there always is such a choice.

For statement (2), first notice that g is orientation-preserving if and only if the permutation of vertices induced by the identifications $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ and $e \leftrightarrow f$ is even. Similarly, the spherical maps agree up to an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism if and only if the number of edge reversals induced by the identifications $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ and $e \leftrightarrow f$ is even. By assumption, the effects of the identification $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ are either both odd or both even. Accordingly, we either implement or do not implement a transposition as in statement (1), part (b) to obtain a diffeomorphism g with the desired properties. □

For d even, an orientation-preserving isomorphism of graphs may induce odd permutations of both the segment-vertex labels and edge labels, for which there is no clear remedy. The mismatch of parities of the dimensions of the source manifold L and the target $\mathbb{R}^d$ is thus one reason that we are confined to working over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for d even. The same problem arises in Lemma 5.6 below. Another problem for even d will arise in Section 5.4 (and Proposition 5.13).

5.2.3. *Collapses induced by gluing closures of principal faces.* Now suppose we have a diffeomorphism $g : \mathrm{int}(\mathfrak{S}(e)) \to \mathrm{int}(\mathfrak{S}(f))$ of the interiors of principal faces of $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ and $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_j]$. We want to extend this identification to the closures of these faces. Because the compactification $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ is a blowup of only *some* of the diagonals, depending on Γ, it is possible that, for example, two corresponding corners of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ and $\mathfrak{S}(f)$ have different codimension. See Figures 2 and 3, which by the following lemma reasonably exemplify the general pathology.

Lemma 5.5. *A diffeomorphism $g : \mathrm{int}(\mathfrak{S}(e)) \to \mathrm{int}(\mathfrak{S}(f))$ extends to a homeomorphism $g : \mathfrak{S}(e) \to \mathfrak{S}(f)$ of the closures after performing certain canonical collapses in possibly both the domain and codomain. Locally, the collapses are submersions of Euclidean spaces.*



FIGURE 2. This is an example where a principal face gluing identifies corners of different dimension, as in [20]. The two graphs (with orientations omitted) agree outside of the pictured portions. Contracting the middle edge in each figure gives isomorphic graphs, so the interiors of the corresponding principal faces can be glued together. Consider the codimension-2 face of the left-hand space indexed by the circled subgraphs, i.e., the double-square and the middle edge. The six vertices in the right-hand graph do not form a biconnected subgraph, so the corresponding corner of the right-hand principal face (where all six points have collided) is indexed by the left triangle, the middle edge, and the right triangle, and is thus a codimension-3 face. The canonical way to identify these corners is via the blow-down map from the left-hand, codimension-2 corner to the right-hand, codimension-3 corner.

Proof. Let us consider the possible effect of the extension of g to the boundary on a corner $\mathfrak{S}_i$ of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$. The corner $\mathfrak{S}_i$ is indexed by list of biconnected subgraphs of Γ_i satisfying the properties given in Section 3.3, among which is the edge e. The graphs Γ_i and Γ_j differ precisely by an edge reconnection as shown in Figure 2, that is, a re-partitioning of those edge-ends which are incident to some endpoint of e. After this reconnection, the corresponding subgraph in Γ_j may no longer be biconnected, and this may increase the codimension of $\mathfrak{S}_i$. Clearly we need to consider the effect of only subgraphs containing at least one endpoint of e:

- If a subgraph Γ' contains only one endpoint of e, then either Γ' remains biconnected, or the union $\Gamma' \cup f$ is a biconnected subgraph. This also leaves the codimension of $\mathfrak{S}_i$ unchanged.
- If a subgraph $\Gamma' \neq e$ contains e, then after reconnection, the corresponding subgraph Γ'' may no longer be biconnected. Let A and B denote the connected components resulting from the removal of f from Γ''. If one of them (say B) is a single vertex, then Γ' is merely replaced by A, and the codimension is unchanged. Otherwise, Γ' is replaced by A, B, and the codimension increases by 1. More concretely, a space of screens labeled by Γ' is replaced by a product of two spaces of screens: one labeled by A and one labeled by B. This lowers the dimension by 1, and in fact, the inverse to this collapse is given by providing a ratio in $[0, \infty]$ of, say, the size of the screen labeled by A to the size of the screen labeled by B:

$$[0,\infty] \times C_A(T_p\mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+) \times C_B(T_p\mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+) \longrightarrow C_{\Gamma'}(T_p\mathbb{R}^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+)$$

It is possible that g induces multiple such collapses of the corner $\mathfrak{S}_i$. The situation with respect to corners in $\mathfrak{S}_j$ is symmetric in that g may also induce collapses of this corner. Note that it is possible that g induces collapses of both corners $\mathfrak{S}_i$ and $\mathfrak{S}_j$, as shown in Figure 3. In any case, the overall modification to each corner is given by forgetting some number of relative rates of approach, and this number is precisely the number by which the codimension increases. We thus see that these collapses are canonical and that they are locally modeled by submersions of Euclidean spaces. □

5.2.4. *From consistently oriented graphs to consistently oriented configuration spaces.* Recall from the proof of Lemma 5.3 that $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of isomorphism classes of graphs in a simplified expression



FIGURE 3. This is an example where a principal face gluing reduces the dimension of both identified corners, even though both corners are of codimension 3. The contraction of the circled edge in each figure yields isomorphic graphs and hence a principal face gluing. For either face, the gluing results in forgetting a relative rate of approach when passing from a double-square to two triangles joined by an edge. That is, we forget the relative sizes of the two triangles involved, which was part of the data in the double-square, and the corners become of codimension 4.

for γ. Recall also that for each P and every Γ_j/f in P, we fixed an isomorphism $\Gamma_i/e \to \Gamma_j/f$ from some fixed Γ_i/e in P. Because distinct P correspond to distinct graphs, the sum of coefficients in each class P must be zero. That is, each class has an even number of principal faces, with an equal number coming from spaces with $+$ signs as from spaces with $-$ signs. Because we have chosen a consistently oriented representative for γ, the identification of a face from a positive term with a face from a negative term will be an orientation-*reversing* map. For each P, group elements of P into $(+,-)$ pairs, in some arbitrary manner. Each $(+,-)$ pair determines an isomorphism of principal faces, which then as in Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5 determines a diffeomorphism of their interiors, collapses of some of their corners, and then a homeomorphism of the resulting closures.

Let g denote the equivalence relation generated by the gluings specified above.

5.3. **Folding certain remaining principal faces.** Recall that graphs with orientation-reversing automorphisms are zero in the graph complex.

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose Γ_i/e has an orientation-reversing automorphism α. Then for odd d, we can take the associated diffeomorphism ι of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ to be orientation-reversing, in which case the spherical maps Φ_{Γ_i} and $\Phi_{\Gamma_i} \circ \iota$ agree up to an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism of the codomain.*

Proof. As in Lemma 5.4 ι, together with an automorphism of e, determines a diffeomorphism of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$, which preserves or reverses orientation according to whether the overall permutation on vertex labels is even or odd. The spherical maps agree if and only if the overall number of edge reversals induced by these two maps is even. By assumption, the effects of ι on vertex labels and edge reversals are of different parity. Thus it suffices to take the automorphism of e to be the identity if those effects are respectively odd and even or the involution if they are respectively even and odd. □

For even d, we have no recourse against an automorphism inducing an odd permutation of edge labels, where neither condition on orientations will be met.

For either parity of d, because ι comes from a graph automorphism, we immediately have the following:

Lemma 5.7. *The map ι extends to the closure of $\mathfrak{S}(e)$, sending every corner homeomorphically either to itself or another corner.* □

Now for either parity of d, we fold $\mathfrak{S}(e)$, identifying $x \in \mathfrak{S}(e)$ with $\iota(x) \in \mathfrak{S}(e)$, for every such principal face in γ. If a principal face has multiple such automorphisms, we arbitrarily choose one (with no claim that different choices will yield identical homeomorphism types).

Let r denote the equivalence relation given by folding all principal faces with orientation-reversing automorphisms.

At this point, the only principal faces unaccounted for are those corresponding to Γ_i/e with a multiple edge. Such a graph is zero in the graph complex because the associated configuration space integral has a factor θ_{ij}^2 and hence vanishes. In our construction, we leave the corresponding face $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ unglued to any other face, to be relegated to the degenerate locus ∂F_γ in Section 5.7.

5.4. **Folding hidden faces with involution.** Having completed principal face gluings, we will modify the result $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]/(c, g, r)$ by folding certain hidden faces. A hidden face of $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ corresponds to a proper, biconnected subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$. We will denote such a hidden face by $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$. Recall that a point in $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ can be described by a configuration in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of the vertices of Γ_i/Γ', together with a configuration of the vertices of Γ' in $T_p\mathbb{R}^d$, modulo translation and oriented scaling, where p is the location of the basepoint in Γ_i/Γ'. (Unlike in the work of Kuperberg and Thurston on 3-manifold invariants, some of these points are constrained to the link, or in the case of the infinitesimal configuration, the tangent line to the link at a point.) Since Γ' is biconnected, it has no 0-valent vertices and no univalent vertices.

In this Subsection, we consider only hidden faces $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ such that Γ' has a bivalent free vertex v. Let u, w be the vertices in Γ' joined by edges to v. We consider an involution of $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ which comes from an involution of the screen space $C_{\Gamma'}(T_pS^d)/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+)$, given by $\iota : x_v \mapsto x_u + x_w - x_v$ and fixing all the other vertices of Γ'. By notational abuse, we also denote the involution of $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ by ι.

Lemma 5.8. *The involution ι extends from the interior of $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ to its corners.*

Proof. We may consider all the relevant cases of subgraphs involved in such a corner, and their associated screen spaces. The only screens possibly affected are those involving v. Those screen spaces involving v but neither u nor w are unaffected; those involving both u and w incur an involution just like the screen space for Γ'; and finally the screen spaces for the edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{v, w\}$ are interchanged. By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5, these are the only cases to consider. □

Thus a corner is mapped to another one only if it involves exactly one of the edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{v, w\}$.

The involution ι is due to Kontsevich [13], and also found in the work of Bott and Taubes [4], D. Thurston [31], Bott and Cattaneo [3], Kuperberg and Thurston [20], and Cattaneo, Cotta-Ramusino, and Longoni [7].

We "fold" $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ via the identification $x \sim \iota(x)$ for every biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$ with a bivalent free vertex. If Γ' has multiple bivalent free vertices, we arbitrarily choose one (again with no claim that different choices yield homeomorphic spaces).

Let h denote the equivalence relation given by folding hidden faces by an involution as above.

Remark 5.9. Note that since we do not blow up all the diagonals of $(T_pS^d)^{V(\Gamma')}$ to get $C_{\Gamma'}[T_pS^d]$, the involution is well defined. In particular, $\Delta_{\{v,u\}}$ and $\Delta_{\{v,w\}}$ are the only two-fold diagonals involving v that are blown up. If we had blown up all the diagonals, then the involution would not be defined on the whole configuration space. Instead, it would only be defined on the configuration space of 3 points corresponding to u, v, w. This latter approach is taken in the setting of integration of forms in [7], where integration over the remaining configuration points is performed before applying the involution to this 3-point configuration space.

5.5. **Collapsing certain remaining hidden faces.** Finally, we want to ensure that all the remaining hidden faces $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ satisfy the conditions that (1) every free vertex in Γ' has valence ≥ 3 and (2) every segment vertex in Γ' has an incident edge (i.e., is joined by an edge to another vertex in Γ'). Condition (1) is ensured by the folding in the previous Subsection; indeed, vertices cannot have valence 0 or 1, since Γ' is biconnected. Condition (2) is not yet satisfied, but we will collapse those faces $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ which violate it. This is the first type of collapse that we will perform. We will also perform a second type of collapse that will be useful later.

For the first type of collapse, suppose $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$ has a segment vertex v with no incident edge. The neighbors u, w of v on the segment must be in Γ' because Γ' is biconnected. Let L be the link over which $F[\Gamma_i]$ is the fiber of $X[\Gamma_i] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$. Recall that $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ can be described as a bundle over $F[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$. The fiber of this latter bundle over a configuration where the basepoint of Γ_i/Γ' is located at $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the subspace of $C_{\Gamma'}[T_p\mathbb{R}^d]/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+)$ with the segment vertices of Γ' constrained to lie in T_pL. This fiber records the "relative rate of approach" $|v-u|/|v-w|$. We can forget this relative rate of approach without altering the associated spherical map (cf. Section 5.8 below). In other words, we will forget v from $C_{\Gamma'}[T_p\mathbb{R}^d]/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+)$, thus mapping $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma)$ to a space whose fiber dimension is 1 lower. Thus in $F[\Gamma_i]$, we have collapsed the codimension-1 face $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ to a codimension-2 face. We perform such a collapse for every subgraph Γ' of some Γ_i with a segment vertex with no incident edge.

Let c_1 denote the equivalence relation which results in this first type of collapse as above.

We will now perform a second type of collapse. It is not strictly necessary for links in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d > 3$, but it is useful for carrying out a similar construction specifically for chord diagrams for links in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (namely Proposition 8.4 below). Suppose Γ_i is a trivalent graph whose underlying unitrivalent graph $U(\Gamma_i)$ is disconnected, and suppose Γ' is a biconnected subgraph of Γ_i. Let A and B be two distinct connected components of $U(\Gamma_i)$. Since Γ' is connected, there must be vertices $v \in A$ and $w \in B$ joined by an arc, but not by an edge. Since Γ' is biconnected and Γ_i is trivalent, the remaining segment neighbors u, x of (respectively) v, w must also be in Γ'. In $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$, we then forget the relative rates of approach of u, v, w, x (without altering the spherical map), thus lowering the dimension of $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ by 2. Perform this collapse for every such Γ'. We will see soon (Lemma 5.16) that we could also just leave this second type of face uncollapsed.

Let c_2 denote the equivalence relation which results in this second type of collapse as above.

5.6. **Implementing the gluings, foldings, and collapses.** Recall the gluings g, the foldings r and h, and the collapses c_1, c_2 from the previous Sections. Define the final glued space F_γ as

$$F_\gamma := \coprod_i \widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]/(g, r, h, c_1, c_2)$$

by which we mean the transitive closure of these equivalence relations. Thus we have a glued space F_γ for *any* cocycle $\gamma = \sum c_i\Gamma_i$. Since γ is minimal, F_γ is connected. The diffeomorphism types of the constituent pieces are independent of the representative expression for γ, though the labelings and orientations are not. The homeomorphism type of this glued space may depend on the arbitrary choices of gluings. Carrying out this gluing for the fibers over all links in the base $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ yields a glued total space X_γ whose fiber over a link in $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ is F_γ. We now establish some properties of F_γ. It need not be a manifold with corners, but it is not too pathological:

Proposition 5.10. *The space F_γ can be given a CW (i.e. cellular) structure.*

Remark 5.11. The reader may replace "singular (co)homology" throughout the paper by "cellular (co)homology" for a more direct interpretation of our construction. However, from a logical standpoint, any (co)homology theory which admits integer coefficients suffices.

Proof. The identifications that produce F_γ are locally of several types, which we now describe.

First, the gluings g locally look like the gluings of two half-balls along their boundary faces, at least at a point in the interior of a codimension-1 face. The same is true of h and r, away from the fixed points of the involutions. Note that for either h or r, we need not treat corners separately from interior points (see Lemma 5.7 and Lemma **??**).

Second, at a corner, g may induce a collapse, as in Lemma 5.5, which is given by forgetting relative rates of approach. Locally, such a collapse is the collapse of a boundary stratum of a Euclidean ball with corners by a standard submersion of Euclidean spaces. The collapses c_1, c_2 are also given by forgetting relative rates of approach and thus have the same local description as those induced by g.

Third, near a fixed point of a hidden face involution, h is locally the identification of points (in the boundary face of a Euclidean ball with corners) with their mirror images across a hyperplane in that boundary face. Fourth and finally, near a fixed point of an automorphism of a principal face, the situation is similar, except that r is locally a permutation of coordinates in the relevant boundary face of a Euclidean ball with corners. In this case, the fixed point set will be some diagonal of this boundary face.

Now imposing all the relations g, r, h, c_1, c_2 may induce foldings or collapses of corners that were not originally implicated (i.e., a corner σ may incur collapses not just from identifications of faces containing it, but also from identifications of faces containing a corner σ' to which σ is glued, and from identifications of faces containing a corner σ'' to which σ' is glued, and so on).

To see the cellular structure on F_γ, start with a triangulation of the original manifold with corners $\coprod_i \widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$, which is sufficiently fine so that it restricts to triangulations of all the strata, as well as the fixed-point sets of the involutions (which are locally linear subspaces). Performing the identifications in the following order will elucidate the structure on the resulting quotient. First perform all the necessary collapses of faces and corners, including those induced by transitivity. Such a quotient clearly inherits a cellular structure. In fact, for a sufficiently fine triangulation, a collapse is on each simplex the collapse of a codimension-1 face to a lower-dimensional simplex. The image of each simplex is then still a ball with a CW structure. Next perform all the necessary foldings, including those induced by transitivity. For a sufficiently fine triangulation, each folding just identifies pairs of cells, some of which may share a boundary face. So the resulting quotient inherits a CW structure. Finally, the gluings just identify certain closed subspaces by homeomorphisms, and again with a sufficiently fine triangulation, the quotient inherits a CW structure. □

5.7. **The degenerate locus.**

Definition 5.12. Consider (the closures of) all the codimension-1 faces in the $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ which have not been glued or folded. Let ∂F_γ their union and, letting the link in the base vary, let ∂X_γ denote the corresponding subspace in X_γ. Every such remaining face is either

- a principal face $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ of some $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ such that Γ_i/e has a multiple edge,
- a hidden face $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ of some $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$ such that Γ' has no bivalent free vertices and no segment vertices without edges, or
- a face at infinity of some $\widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]$.

(Note that the converse is not true, since some hidden faces as in the list above were collapsed to higher codimension in the previous Subsection.) We think of ∂F_γ (or ∂X_γ) as the *degenerate locus* of F_γ (respectively X_γ).

The following is the most important property of F_γ:

Proposition 5.13. *For d odd, the space F_γ has a fundamental cycle over $\mathbb{Z}$ relative to ∂F_γ. (By this we mean that the chain consisting of all the top-dimensional cells in some cell structure on F_γ is a cycle in $H_*(F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma; \mathbb{Z})$.) For d even, the same is true over $\mathbb{Z}/2$.*

Proof. Each $F[\Gamma_i]$ has a fundamental class $[F[\Gamma_i]]$ relative to its boundary, which we may view as the union of top-dimensional cells in some given cell structure. The class $\sum_i [F[\Gamma_i]]$ will be our desired class. First, it is obvious that all types of collapses only remove some boundary terms from $[F[\Gamma_i]]$. Next, we address the folding by the hidden face involutions. For d odd, each involution ι is orientation-reversing, so these hidden faces disappear from $\partial[F[\Gamma_i]]$. For the principal faces, recall that each gluing of some $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ to some other $-\mathfrak{S}(f)$ in Section 5.2.4 (or of a face $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ to itself in Section 5.3) is orientation-reversing for d odd, so these faces also disappear from $\partial \sum_i [F[\Gamma_i]]$. For d even, the foldings and gluings may be orientation-preserving, in which case the corresponding faces are eliminated (only) modulo 2 from $\partial \sum_i [F[\Gamma_i]]$. □

Note also that F_γ is connected, by minimality of γ.

5.8. **Mapping to spheres.** Recall that before gluing and folding, each piece $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i] := X[\Gamma_i] \times (S^{d-1})^{a_i}$ of X_γ had a map Φ_i to the N-fold cartesian product $(S^{d-1})^N$. The gluing and folding do not quite respect these maps, but they will if we allow for certain symmetries of this cartesian product.

We will now define two subgroups of symmetries of $(S^{d-1})^N$, a group G_o for the case of d odd and a group G_e for the case of d even. For the odd case, let G_o be the subgroup generated by the symmetric group Σ_N (which acts by just permuting the factors) and by all two-fold products $\alpha_j \alpha_k$, where α_j denotes the antipodal map on the j-th copy of S^{d-1}. Note that every element of G_o acts by an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism. For the even case, let G_e be the subgroup generated by Σ_N and all antipodal maps α_j. In this case, the antipodal maps preserve orientation, but the permutations may not.

First consider the quotient $(S^{d-1})^N/G_o$. It is well known that if a space Y has an action of a group G, then for any field k of characteristic zero, $H^*(Y/G; k)$ maps isomorphically onto the G-invariant subspace $(H^*(Y; k))^G$ [2, Chapter III]. Thus, since G_o preserves orientation, the top cohomology $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G_o; k)$ is one-dimensional, generated by the class of the N-fold product of (the preimage of) any generating cochain $\omega \in H^{d-1}(S^{d-1})$. Then by the universal coefficient theorem, the free part of $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G;\ \mathbb{Z})$ is one-dimensional. Let $\omega^{(N)}$ be a generator of this group. Note that $\omega^{(N)}$ can be reduced mod p to a nontrivial class with $\mathbb{Z}/p$ coefficients.

For the quotient $(S^{d-1})^N/G_e$ for d even, we must settle for working over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, since G_e does not always preserve orientation. (In particular, the hidden face involutions certainly induce transpositions in Σ_N.) In this case, the N-fold product of (the preimage of) a generator $\omega \in H^{d-1}(S^{d-1};\ \mathbb{Z}/2)$ represents a nontrivial class $\omega^{(N)} \in H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G;\ \mathbb{Z}/2)$. (This can for example be deduced from a theorem of Nakaoka [23], considering the identity Steenrod operation, though a more elementary argument would likely suffice.)

If we want to allow either possibility G_o or G_e, we will simply write G. Furthermore, for the rest of this Section, cohomology will be interpreted with $\mathbb{Z}$ coefficients for d odd and $\mathbb{Z}/2$ coefficients for d even.

Lemma 5.14. *The maps $\Phi_i : \widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i] \to (S^{d-1})^N$ induce a continuous map $\Phi_\gamma : X_\gamma \to (S^{d-1})^N/G$.*

Proof. We just have to check that the identifications of faces by gluing, folding, and collapsing respect the map Φ_i, up to the action of G. First, the involution ι used to fold a hidden face of $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$ satisfies $\Phi_i(x) = \Phi_i(\iota(x))$ on the nose (since $\{v, u\}$ and $\{v, w\}$ are the only edges connected to v). Furthermore, the two types of collapses in Section 5.5 respect Φ_i on the nose, since the relative rates of approach along the segment are inconsequential to the map Φ_i. In the case of d odd, when we glued a principal face of $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$ to $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_j]$, we arranged for the edges of Γ_i and Γ_j to be identified so that there is an even number of edge-reversals. This corresponds to an even number of antipodal maps (plus possibly a permutation of the edges, i.e., permutation of factors of S^{d-1}), which is an element of G. Similarly, for d odd, when we folded a principal face of $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]$, we

arranged for an even-number of edge reversals in the automorphism ι of Γ_i; so $\Phi_i(x)$ and $\Phi_i(\iota(x))$ differ by an element of G. For d even, the definition of G_e makes the result obvious. □

Letting the link in the base $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ vary, we get a similar map from the total space of the glued bundle:

$$\Phi_\gamma : X_\gamma \to (S^{d-1})^N/G.$$

Thus we can pull back $\omega^{(N)} \in H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G)$ via this map. The resulting cohomology class is the class to be integrated along the fiber F_γ.

Definition 5.15. Let $\mathcal{R} \subset (S^{d-1})^N/G$ denote the image of ∂X_γ under Φ_γ. (This is a subspace which we will work relative to.)

Lemma 5.16. *This image $\mathcal{R}$ is a union of positive-codimension subspaces of $(S^{d-1})^N/G$.*

Proof. We check the statement for each of the types of faces listed in Section 5.7. First, for a principal face $\mathfrak{S}(e)$ such that Γ_i/e has a multiple edge, the image of Φ_i in $(S^{d-1})^N/G$ is contained in the image (under the quotient by G) of some diagonal in $(S^{d-1})^N$. Hence it has positive codimension.

Now we consider the remaining faces. Since G is finite and each face of X_γ is just a face of some $X[\Gamma_i]$, it suffices to show that the images under the original spherical maps Φ_i have positive codimension in $(S^{d-1})^N$. Now each face of $X[\Gamma_i]$ corresponds to a biconnected subgraph of $\Sigma\Gamma_i$. There are two possibilities according to whether or not ∞ is in this subgraph. If it is, this face corresponds to $\Sigma\Gamma'$ for a connected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$. If it is not, then the face corresponds to a biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$. The faces at infinity are precisely the faces in Cases II and IV, the remaining hidden faces are addressed by Cases I and III. The arguments below are topological restatements of the arguments given in [7, 18], and we have preserved the numbering of the various cases used in those references. These arguments use the descriptions of faces in terms of screens given in Section 3.3, in just the case of codimension 1.

Case I: Let $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ be a face of $X[\Gamma_i]$ corresponding to a biconnected $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$, so that ∞ is not involved in the collision. Suppose also that there are no segment vertices in Γ_i. Then $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ is a bundle over $X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$ with fiber which we denote $\overline{C}_{\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d]$. This fiber is $C_{\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d]/(\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathbb{R}_+)$, a space of configurations modulo translation and scaling, which can be thought of as a space of infinitesimal configurations. In the case where there are no segment vertices in Γ', the standard framing on $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be used to trivialize this bundle. Then the map

$$\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma') = X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma'] \times \overline{C}_{\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \longrightarrow (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma_i)} = (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma_i/\Gamma')} \times (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma')}$$

factors as a product, and it suffices to show that the map $\overline{C}_{\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma')}$ has positive codimension. If s is the number of (free) vertices in Γ', then the dimension of the domain is $ds - d - 1$, and

$$(d-1)|E(\Gamma')| - (ds - d - 1) \geq (d-1)\frac{3s}{2} - (ds - d - 1) = \frac{1}{2}(d-3)(s+2) + 4 > 0.$$

This finishes the case of a collision of free vertices, away from infinity.

Case II: Next consider the case of $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ with $\Sigma\Gamma' \subset \Sigma\Gamma_i$ biconnected, and with no segment vertices in Γ'. Such an $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ is also given by a product bundle $X[\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma'] \times \overline{C}_{\Sigma\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d]$. To see this, note first that the base is the subspace of $X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$ where the basepoint of Γ_i/Γ' is fixed at $\infty \in S^d$. Note also that the fiber describes all collisions of points in Γ' with $\infty \in S^d$. Once again, we can factor the map

$$\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma') = X[\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma'] \times \overline{C}_{\Sigma\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \longrightarrow (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma_i)} = (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma')} \times (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma')}$$

as a product, and it suffices to show that $\overline{C}_{\Sigma\Gamma'}[\mathbb{R}^d] \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma')}$ has positive codimension. If s is the number of (free) vertices in Γ', then the dimension of the domain is $d(s+1) - d - 1 = ds - 1$,

and

$$(d-1)|E(\Gamma')| - (ds-1) \geq (d-1)\frac{3s}{2} - (ds-1) = \frac{1}{2}(d-3)s + 1 > 0.$$

Case III: Let $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ be a hidden face not involving infinity, but with Γ' having $r > 0$ segment vertices, as well as s free vertices. Then this face is a bundle over $X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$ whose fiber we denote $\overline{F}[\Gamma']$. A point in the base $X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$ is a link L together with a configuration of the vertices of Γ_i/Γ' in $\mathbb{R}^d$; let $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the location of the basepoint of Γ_i/Γ'. Then $\overline{F}[\Gamma_i]$ is the subspace of $C_{\Gamma'}[T_p\mathbb{R}^d]$ where the segment vertices are constrained to lie on the line T_pL, quotiented by positive scaling and translations which preserve T_pL. Now there is a related bundle $S^{d-1} \rtimes \overline{F}[\Gamma_i]$ with the same fiber $\overline{F}[\Gamma_i]$ over S^{d-1}. Its total space is given by allowing the (oriented) tangent line T_pL to vary over all possible directions in S^{d-1}. The space $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ maps to this bundle and in fact, as a bundle over $X[\Gamma_i/\Gamma']$, it is the pullback of this bundle over S^{d-1} by the unit derivative of L at the point p. Since the composite $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma') \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma_i)} \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma')}$ factors through $S^{d-1} \rtimes \overline{F}[\Gamma'] \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma')}$, it suffices to show that the image of this latter map has positive codimension. The dimension of the domain is $(d-1) + r + ds - 2 = d + r + ds - 3$, and

$$(d-1)|E(\Gamma')| - (d+r+ds-3) \geq (d-1)\frac{r+3s}{2} - (d+r+ds-3) = \frac{1}{2}(d-3)(r+s-2).$$

Since $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ is a hidden face (not involving infinity), $r + s > 2$. The right-hand side above is thus positive, provided $d > 3$.

Case IV: Finally, we consider the case of a collision at ∞ along the link L. So $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_i$ has $r > 0$ segment vertices and s free vertices, and $\Sigma\Gamma_i$ is biconnected. Much like in the case of a face at infinity with no segment vertices, such a face $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ is a product bundle $X[\Gamma_i \setminus \Gamma'] \times \overline{F}[\Sigma\Gamma']$. Here the fiber $\overline{F}[\Sigma\Gamma']$ is a quotient the subspace of $C_{\Sigma\Gamma'}[T_\infty S^d]$ where $\infty \in \Sigma\Gamma'$ is fixed, and where the segment vertices are constrained to lie on the subset $T_\infty L$; the quotient is by positive scaling. Thus the dimension of $C_{\Sigma\Gamma'}[T_\infty S^d]$ is $r + ds - 1$. Now the map $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma') \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma'}$ factors through $\overline{F}[\Sigma\Gamma'] \to (S^{d-1})^{E(\Gamma'}$. We check that the image of the latter map has positive codimension. In fact, since the domain has dimension $r + ds - 1$, this codimension is at least

$$(d-1)|E(\Gamma')| - (r+ds-1) \geq (d-1)\frac{r+3s}{2} - (r+ds-1) = \frac{1}{2}(d-3)(r+s) + 1 > 0.$$

□

Notice that Case III in the proof above is the only place in our whole construction where we need to require that $d > 3$. Lemma 5.16 immediately implies the following statement.

Proposition 5.17. *The maps*

$$H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R}) \to H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G) \to H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N)$$

are surjective, where we take coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ for d odd and in $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for d even. In particular, in either case, a generator $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N)$ has a preimage $\omega^{(N)}$ in $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R})$. □

Such a relative cohomology class $\omega^{(N)}$ is the class that we will integrate over the fiber, but in singular (co)homology rather than in de Rham cohomology, as we will explain in Section 6.

6. Homological triviality of the Bott–Taubes bundle

This Section provides the last necessary ingredient for our main result. To perform fiberwise integration over $\mathbb{Z}$ (or $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for d even), we use the cross product in homology, as outlined in Section 2.4. This is facilitated by Proposition 6.1 and ultimately Proposition 6.6, which address the homological triviality of our bundle over the space of links.

Proposition 6.1. *The Bott–Taubes bundle $X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}_d^m = \mathrm{Emb}(\coprod_m \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ has the same (co)homology groups as the product bundle $F[\Gamma] \times \mathcal{L}_d^m$, where (co)homology may be taken with any coefficient group.*

The above Proposition previously appeared in an unpublished section of the author's 2010 PhD thesis, though Lemma 6.5 was missing from the proof therein. We will deduce this Proposition from several applications of the Serre spectral sequence, including in the next two lemmas. First, we describe the cohomology of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$. Since this space is a manifold with corners, its interior $C_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is homotopy equivalent to it and thus a suitable replacement for cohomology calculations. Recall that

$$C_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d) = \{(x_1, ..., x_{|V(\Gamma)|}) | \{i \neq j\} \in E(\Gamma) \Rightarrow x_i \neq x_j\}.$$

Lemma 6.2. *Let $n = |V(\Gamma)|$. Fix any ordering on $V(\Gamma)$, and let Γ_k be the subgraph of Γ on the first k vertices and all edges between them. Then for any coefficient group*

$$H^*(C_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cong \bigotimes_{k=2}^{n} H^* \left(\bigvee_{\{i \neq j\} \in E(\Gamma_k)} S^{d-1} \right) \tag{9}$$

where the wedge is taken over all pairs of distinct vertices joined by some edge. (In particular, a multiple edge contributes only one factor of S^{d-1} in the wedge.)

Proof of Lemma 6.2. This calculation is a mild generalization of a Serre spectral sequence calculation of $H^*(C_n(\mathbb{R}^d))$ from F. Cohen's PhD thesis. (The latter setting is the case where Γ is the complete graph on n vertices.) We provide the full argument here since we rely on it heavily.

First consider cohomology with integer coefficients. As in the work of F. Cohen [8, Part III, p. 250, Lemma 6.2], we will proceed by induction on the number of vertices, where the basis case of $n = 2$ is clear. Consider the fibration $C_{\Gamma_n}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to C_{\Gamma_{n-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $d \geq 3$, the action of the fundamental group of the base on the fiber is trivial because this fundamental group is itself trivial. The fiber is the complement in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of points corresponding to vertices that are joined to the n-th vertex in $\Gamma = \Gamma_n$. This fiber is homotopy equivalent to a wedge of copies of S^{d-1} over all (non-self-loop) edges incident to the n-th vertex. Consider the associated Serre spectral sequence, where the inductive hypothesis gives the cohomology of the base. The triviality of the fundamental group and the fact that both the cohomology of the base and the fiber are free $\mathbb{Z}$-modules imply that the E_2 term is

$$\bigotimes_{k=2}^{n-1} H^* \left(\bigvee_{\{i \neq j\} \in E_{\Gamma_k}} S^{d-1} \right) \otimes H^* \left(\bigvee_{\{i \neq n\} \in E(\Gamma)} S^{d-1} \right),$$

that is, $E_2^{p,q}$ is the tensor product of the module of degree-p elements in the left-hand factor with the module of degree-q elements in the right-hand factor. Thus $E_2^{p,q}$ is zero unless p and q are both multiples of $d-1$. Thus d_2 is zero since either its source or its target is zero. More generally, the square lattice of nonzero terms implies that every d_n is zero, so the spectral sequence collapses at E_2, and we get the desired result over $\mathbb{Z}$. Since this resulting group is a free module, the result holds for any coefficient group, by the universal coefficient theorem. □

Recall that $U(\Gamma)$ is the underlying unitrivalent graph of Γ.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $n = |V(\Gamma)|$. Fix any ordering of $V(\Gamma)$ in which the first q vertices are precisely the segment vertices of Γ. Then for any coefficient group*

$$H^*(F(\Gamma)) \cong \bigotimes_{k=q+1}^{n} H^* \left(\bigvee_{\{i \neq j\} \in E(U(\Gamma_k))} S^{d-1} \right) \tag{10}$$

where the wedge is taken over all pairs of distinct vertices joined by some edge.

Proof of Lemma 6.3. For the purposes of calculating cohomology, we may replace $F[\Gamma]$ by its interior $F(\Gamma)$ as in the previous Lemma. As above, we may first work over $\mathbb{Z}$ and then deduce the more general result by the universal coefficient theorem. The cohomology of $F(\Gamma_q) = F(s(\Gamma))$ (using notation from Definition 4.1) is trivial because

$$F(s(\Gamma)) \cong \prod_{i=1}^{m} C_{q_i}[\mathbb{R}] \cong \prod_{i=1}^{m} \Delta^{q_i}$$

where m is the number of link components (components in L), and q_i is the number of segment vertices on the i-th component. Then, for any value of q, we proceed by induction on the number t of free vertices in Γ. The statement of the Lemma is easily seen to hold for $t = 0$. For the inductive step, consider the fibration $F(\Gamma_{q+t}) \to F(\Gamma_{q+t-1})$ and its associated Serre spectral sequence. The rest of the argument is similar to the proof of Lemma 6.2 and yields the claimed decomposition, over $\mathbb{Z}$, and hence for any coefficient group. □

Lemma 6.4. *The inclusion $i : F[\Gamma] \hookrightarrow C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ induces a surjection i^* in cohomology.*

Proof of Lemma 6.4. With notation as above, consider for any $k \in \{2, ..., n\}$ the map of fibrations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(\Gamma_k) & \longrightarrow & C_{\Gamma_k}(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F(\Gamma_{k-1}) & \longrightarrow & C_{\Gamma_{k-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \end{array}$$

For each k, the map on the cohomology of the fibers is given by killing the wedge summands of S^{d-1} corresponding to the arcs in Γ (and mapping isomorphically between the remaining summands). Thus the same is true for the map induced by i from expression (9) to expression (10) (since either expression is the tensor product of the cohomologies of the fibers above over all possible k). □

Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4 above are the only places where we rely on using *long* links. It is possible that further arguments could establish homological triviality of the Bott–Taubes bundle for closed links (or that the Serre spectral sequence still allows fiberwise integration by the cross product). In any case, our methods below do not apply as immediately in the case of closed links.

Lemma 6.5. *The action of $\pi_1(\mathcal{L}^d_m)$ on the fiber $F[\Gamma]$ is trivial.*

Proof of Lemma 6.5. For the bundle $X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$, the monodromy on $H^*(F[\Gamma])$ can be described as follows. A loop in the base is an isotopy of a link, which by the isotopy extension theorem (see for example [12]) extends to an isotopy (in fact a diffeotopy) of the ambient $\mathbb{R}^d$. This induces a diffeotopy of $C_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which restricts to a diffeotopy of $F(\Gamma)$, and hence of $F[\Gamma]$ as well. The diffeotopy is a path from the identity to some diffeomorphism of $F[\Gamma]$, which we want to show induces the identity map on cohomology. But this follows from its being homotopic to the identity map on $F[\Gamma]$. □

Proof of Proposition 6.1. The bundle $X[\Gamma]$ sits inside a trivial bundle as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F[\Gamma] & \xhookrightarrow{i} & C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X[\Gamma] & \xhookrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{L}^d_m \times C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{L}^d_m & = & \mathcal{L}^d_m \end{array} \tag{11}$$

Consider the Serre spectral sequence for each bundle and the map between them induced by the above map of bundles. Let d_n denote the differentials in either spectral sequence. As in the previous arguments in this Section, we will first consider cohomology with $\mathbb{Z}$ coefficients. We have seen above that $H^*(F[\Gamma])$ and $H^*(C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d])$ are free $\mathbb{Z}$-modules and that (by Lemma 6.5) the monodromy of each bundle is trivial. Thus the E_2 terms of these spectral sequences are just products $H^*(\mathcal{L}^d_m) \otimes H^*(F[\Gamma])$ and $H^*(\mathcal{L}^d_m) \otimes H^*(C_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d))$. By Lemma 6.4, the map i^* on the cohomology of the fibers is surjective, hence so is the map i^* on the E_2 term. Since the right-hand bundle is trivial, the differentials d_n are 0 for $n \geq 2$. So $d_2 i^* = i^* d_2 = 0$ together with surjectivity of i^* implies $d_2 = 0$ for the spectral sequence for the left-hand bundle. Similarly, all the differentials d_n, $n \geq 2$, vanish for the left-hand spectral sequence. Hence its E_2 page is the E_∞ page, and the bundle has the cohomology of a trivial bundle over $\mathbb{Z}$. The universal coefficient theorem and the five lemma then imply the result for any coefficient group. A similar argument applies to its *homology* by rephrasing Lemma 6.4 as *injectivity* of i_*. □

We now just need to adapt Proposition 6.1 to the setting of our glued bundle X_γ. This is the ultimate result of this Section.

Proposition 6.6. *For each integer-valued cocycle γ, the glued bundle X_γ has the (co)homology of a product bundle, $H^*(X_\gamma) \cong H^*(\mathcal{L}^d_m \times F_\gamma)$. The same is true relative to the remaining boundary faces: $H^*(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma) \cong H^*(\mathcal{L}^d_m \times F_\gamma, \mathcal{L}^d_m \times \partial F_\gamma)$.*

Proof. We begin with the statement in absolute cohomology. First, we check that when we glue the bundles $\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i] = X[\Gamma_i] \times (S^{d-1})^{a_i}$ along their principal faces, the resulting bundle has the homology of a product. To check this for the gluing of any pair of bundles along a principal face, it suffices to consider the associated Mayer–Vietoris sequence. The statement is true for the terms $H^*(\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i])$ and $H^*(\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_j])$, hence for their direct-sum as well. The intersection term in the sequence is the cohomology of a bundle whose fiber is the principal face along which we glue. Since say $H_*(\widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i])$ maps surjectively to this term, the same argument as above shows that it too has the cohomology of a product bundle. By the Five Lemma, this is then also true for the glued union. Finally, we can apply induction to get the result for the bundle obtained after all the principal face gluings.

Now we just have to check that the result remains true after we fold the hidden faces with involution. Consider the inclusion (11). Notice that we can glue the fibers on the right-hand side of (11) along their principal faces, just as we do for the spaces on the left-hand side. (In fact, it is even more straightforward for the spaces $C_{\Gamma_i}[\mathbb{R}^d]$ because we do not have to keep track of different numbers of factors of S^{d-1}.) We can also fold the hidden faces of $C_\Gamma[\mathbb{R}^d]$ in the same way as we did for $F[\Gamma]$. Thus we have an inclusion of bundles

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F_\gamma = \coprod_i \widetilde{F}[\Gamma_i]/\sim & \xhookrightarrow{\ i\ } & \coprod_i C_{\Gamma_i}[\mathbb{R}^d]/\sim \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X_\gamma = \coprod_i \widetilde{X}[\Gamma_i]/\sim & \xhookrightarrow{\ i\ } & \mathcal{L}^d_m \times \left(\coprod_i C_{\Gamma_i}[\mathbb{R}^d]\right)/\sim \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{L}^d_m & = & \mathcal{L}^d_m
\end{array}$$

We claim that the inclusion i induces an surjection in cohomology. So far we know this for the spaces obtained by just the principal face gluings. Now we consider the effect on the left- and right-hand fibers of folding according to the hidden face involution $v \mapsto w + u - v$. In either case, there are "spherical" $(d-1)$-dimensional classes ω_{vw} and ω_{vu} which are among the generators of the cohomology. And in either case, the effect of folding according to the involution is to identify ω_{vw} with $-\omega_{vu}$. This shows that i still induces a surjection in cohomology after the folding. Then

by the same proof as for Proposition 6.1, we conclude that the bundle X_γ has the cohomology of a product bundle.

A similar argument shows that the cohomology of the remaining faces $\partial X_\gamma \subset X_\gamma$ is isomorphic to the cohomology of a trivial bundle $\mathcal{L}^d_m \times \partial F_\gamma$. Thus (by the Five Lemma) the same is true for the relative cohomology: $H^*(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma) \cong H^*(\mathcal{L}^d_m \times F_\gamma, \mathcal{L}^d_m \times \partial F_\gamma)$. □

7. The Main Result

Having done most of the required work in the previous two Sections, we have almost established our main result. We will now state it and give what remains of its proof. We first recall the key facts and note a simple calculation.

Recall the map $\Phi_\gamma : X_\gamma \to (S^{d-1})^N/G$, where G is G_o (respectively G_e) for d odd (respectively even). As before, G_o is the group generated by the symmetric group Σ_N on N letters and products of even numbers of antipodal maps on the factors S^{d-1}, while G_e is generated by Σ_N and all antipodal maps. Recall that $\mathcal{R}$ is the image of the degenerate locus ∂X_γ under Φ_γ, and that we have a map of pairs: $\Phi_\gamma : (X_\gamma,\ \partial X_\gamma) \to ((S^{d-1})^N/G,\ \mathcal{R})$. Proposition 5.17 guarantees the existence of a class $\omega^{(N)} \in H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G, \mathcal{R})$ which maps to a generator of $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N)$, where we take coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ for d odd and coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for d even. Explicitly, we can take $\omega^{(N)}$ to be the N-fold symmetric product of an antipodally (anti-)symmetric cochain which vanishes on the (positive-codimension) degenerate locus $\mathcal{R}$.

For our theorem statement, we also want to know the dimension of the fiber F_γ of the bundle $X_\gamma \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$. Note that by construction its dimension is the dimension of $F[\Gamma_i]$ for Γ_i with the maximum number of edges N among graphs appearing in γ. From the definition of defect k and order n, one can calculate that this dimension is $(3-d)n - k + N(d-1)$.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\gamma = \sum_i c_i \Gamma_i$ be an integer-valued graph cocycle in $\mathcal{D}^k_n$.*

For $d > 3$ odd, consider the composition

$$H^{N(d-1)}(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^{N(d-1)}(\mathcal{L}^d_m \times F_\gamma, \mathcal{L}^d_m \times \partial F_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H^{(d-3)n+k}(\mathcal{L}^d_m; \mathbb{Z})$$

of the isomorphism established by Proposition 6.6, followed by the dual to the map on chains given by $a \mapsto a \times [F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma]$. Then the image of $\Phi^*_\gamma(\omega^{(N)})$ under this composition is $\sum_i c_i I_{\Gamma_i}$, the sum of configuration space integrals associated to γ. Thus we realize the configuration space integral cohomology classes over $\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, for defect $k = 0$, this produces nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}$-valued classes.

For $d > 3$ even, the composition

$$H^{N(d-1)}(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^{N(d-1)}(\mathcal{L}^d_m \times F_\gamma, \mathcal{L}^d_m \times \partial F_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2) \longrightarrow H^{(d-3)n+k}(\mathcal{L}^d_m; \mathbb{Z}/2)$$

takes $\Phi^*_\gamma(\omega^{(N)})$ to the modulo-2 reduction of $\sum_i c_i I_{\Gamma_i}$. So in this case, we realize the configuration space integral cohomology classes over $\mathbb{Z}/2$. Moreover, for defect $k = 0$, this produces nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}/2$-valued classes.

Proof. The main work needed was constructing the glued space X_γ and ensuring it satisfies certain important properties, thus enabling us to state the theorem. We now summarize these important properties. We ensured that the fiber F_γ has a fundamental class relative to its boundary ∂F_γ (Lemma 5.13). This established the existence of the right-hand map above induced by the cross product with $[F_\gamma, \partial F_\gamma]$. We needed Lemmas 5.14 and 5.16 to obtain the map Φ_γ as a map of pairs $(X_\gamma,\ \partial X_\gamma) \to ((S^{d-1})^N/G,\ \mathcal{R})$ with $\mathcal{R}$ of positive codimension. This provided the existence of $\Phi^*_\gamma(\omega^{(N)})$ in the statement. We can now deduce the theorem from the following basic points:

1. The sum of integrals over a collection of spaces is the integral over the disjoint union of spaces.
2. We can pass from the disjoint union to a quotient after gluings and folding of boundary faces.

(3) Fiberwise integration can be realized as the dual to the cross product with the fundamental class of the fiber. This holds true even in the case of fibers with boundary, provided the forms to be integrated vanish on the boundary.

Point (1) is elementary. Point (2) can be shown by exhausting the glued-and-folded space by smooth subspaces with complement of arbitrarily small measure. Point (3) is the statement of Lemma 2.9, combined with Proposition 6.6. The last statement about nontriviality in defect 0 follows from the rest of the Theorem and the nontriviality of the configuration space integral classes in defect 0. □

Remark 7.2. For $d \geq 5$, by [7, Proposition 4.5] the choice of ω does not affect the resulting cohomology class obtained by integration (and thus the class obtained by our construction in singular cohomology).

Example 7.3 (The order-2 cocycle)**.** Consider the cocycle of order 2 for d odd from Example 4.6. This (signed) sum of two graphs corresponds to two (oriented) configuration spaces X and Y, where Y has the orientation opposite from the canonical one coming from the vertex labels. There are three pairs of principal faces glued to each other, and each gluing identifies a face of X with a face of Y. We thus obtain a $\mathbb{Z}$-valued cohomology class in the space of long knots in $\mathbb{R}^d$, d odd. Our construction in this example is similar to that of Polyak and Viro [27]. The main difference is that they make a glued space involving 6 copies of each of X and Y, whereas we take only one copy of each because our spherical map Φ_γ lands in a *symmetric* product of spheres. Although their construction is for long knots in $\mathbb{R}^3$, rather than $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d > 3$, our construction for this example is otherwise the same (cf. Remark 8.3).

We may also consider the cocycle (8) for d even, though there we only obtain a class over $\mathbb{Z}/2$.

Example 7.4 (The triple linking number for long links)**.** For long links of 3 components in $\mathbb{R}^d$, d odd, there is a cocycle of defect 0 and order 2:



This cocycle gives rise via integration (and hence via our construction) to the Milnor triple linking number for long links. Our present construction in the case of this cocycle yields the same glued space as in our previous work [17], after correcting that previous work for some sign errors.[c] Namely, we glue together four spaces T, L, M, R corresponding to the four terms above. The space T has three principal faces, with each one glued to the principal face of L, M, or R. There are no hidden faces with involution, so the remaining codimension-1 faces are just part of the degenerate locus.

We could write down further examples, coming from higher-order cocycles in defect 0. For example, there is a cocycle of order 3 and defect 0 [7, Section 5.1, Figure 3]. Clearing denominators gives an integral cocycle, with six terms, so there are copies of six types of spaces glued together.

Recall that in general, defect-0 cocycles are precisely cocycles of (uni)trivalent diagrams. These correspond to finite-type invariants of knots and links, by the "Fundamental Theorem of Finite-Type Invariants." (Bar-Natan's paper [1] is a well known reference, in which defect-0 graph cocycles

[c]These errors were due to an incorrect identification between the Lie orientation and the "integration orientation," i.e., the vertex-labelings and edge-orientations. See [19] for more details on this identification.

appear as functionals on the quotient of trivalent diagrams by the STU relation.) We may combine our construction and the nontriviality in defect 0 (as mentioned in Theorem 7.1) with this correspondence:

Corollary 7.5. *For each $\mathbb{Z}$-valued finite-type invariant of m-component long links ($m \geq 1$), we have a nontrivial integer-valued cohomology class in $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ for any $d > 3$ odd, and a nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}/2$-valued cohomology class in $\mathcal{L}^d_m$ for any $d > 3$ even.* □

Example 7.6. Sakai found a cocycle of defect 1 in the graph complex for long knots in *odd*-dimensional Euclidean space. This cocycle has nine terms (with coefficients $\pm 1, \pm 2$), so we refer the reader to [28, Figure 10] for the precise expression. Our construction produces $\mathbb{Z}$-valued cohomology classes in embedding spaces out of such cocycles, just as it does for defect-0 cocycles. (Similarly, Longoni found a defect-1 cocycle in the space of closed knots in even-dimensional Euclidean space [22]. Our methods would have to be adapted to closed knots and links to immediately produce a class out of this cocycle, and even so, they presently succeed only over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for d even.)

Remark 7.7. Pelatt constructed nontrivial homology classes over $\mathbb{Z}$ in spaces of long knots in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for d even [24]. In future work, we plan to combine our present methods with this work to study the Vassiliev/Sinha spectral sequence for the homology of the space of long knots over $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/p$. Our present methods apply more successfully for odd d than even d, but the methods of Pelatt apply equally well to either parity. Her paper [24] restricts to the case of d even because some particular results therein use the abovementioned cocycle of Longoni.

8. Further generalizations over $\mathbb{Z}/p$

We now present a generalization of the above main result to mod-p classes which are not necessarily mod-p reductions of the above integer-valued classes. (Note that the result over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for d even in Theorem 7.1 concerns precisely mod-2 reductions of elements in an integer lattice of configuration space integral classes.) We let p be prime, and we consider mod-p cocycles γ. That is, the graph cochain complex can be defined over $\mathbb{Z}/p$, with $\mathbb{Z}/p$-vector spaces generated by graphs, and a differential given by edge contractions with the same signs as over $\mathbb{Z}$, but of course reduced modulo p. Every nontrivial cocycle over $\mathbb{Z}$ reduces to a nontrivial cocycle over $\mathbb{Z}/p$, but there are also new cocycles over $\mathbb{Z}/p$. (In fact, there is a known example for $p = 2$; cf. Example 8.2 below.) We make some brief comments on the case of odd p (Section 8.2), but we mostly focus on $p = 2$ (Section 8.1). In the last part of this paper (Section 8.3), we shift focus to the classical case $d = 3$. Our methods for recovering known classes over $\mathbb{Z}$ break down in that case, but we are still able to construct classes over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ for $d = 3$.

8.1. **The case of $p = 2$.** The remarks in this Subsection apply equally well to the cases of d odd and d even, since orientations of graphs are irrelevant over $\mathbb{Z}/2$. Suppose $\gamma = \sum c_i \Gamma_i$ is a mod-2 cocycle. That means that every isomorphism class of principal face in the associated union of configuration space bundles $\coprod_i X[\Gamma_i]$ appears an even number of times. Topologically, we get a cocycle for the following reason: we can glue these faces in pairs, without regard to orientation, to create a space which, relative to its boundary, still has a fundamental cycle over $\mathbb{Z}/2$. As before the remaining faces can be folded, collapsed, or left to the degenerate locus which we work relative to. The resulting space X_γ will have a fundamental cycle modulo 2 and will also have an appropriate spherical map. More precisely, since the quotient $S^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}P^{d-1}$ induces an isomorphism in cohomology with $\mathbb{Z}/2$ coefficients, we may as well forget signs everywhere and take Φ_γ to be the induced map $X_\gamma \to \mathrm{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^{d-1})$. This obviates the need to keep track of orientations on different graphs in γ, as in Section 5. As before, let $\mathcal{R}$ be the image under Φ_γ of the remaining faces of X_γ. Let $\omega^{(N)}$ be a class in $H^{N(d-1)}(\mathbb{R}P^{d-1}, \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ which maps to a generator of $H^{N(d-1)}(\mathbb{R}P^{d-1}; \mathbb{Z}/2)$. By the same reasoning as in Theorem 7.1, this mod-2 construction leads to the following statement.

Proposition 8.1. *Suppose $d > 3$ is odd. Let γ be a mod-2 graph cocycle in $\mathcal{D}_n^k$, and let X_γ, Φ_γ, R, and $\omega^{(N)}$ be as given above. Consider the composition*

$$H^{N(d-1)}(X_\gamma, \partial X_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^{N(d-1)}(\mathcal{L}_m^d \times F_\gamma, \mathcal{L}_m^d \times \partial F_\gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2) \longrightarrow H^{(d-3)n+k}(\mathcal{L}_m^d; \mathbb{Z}/2)$$

where the first map is the isomorphism from Proposition 6.1 and the second map is induced by the cross product. Then the image of $\Phi_\gamma^*(\omega^{(N)})$ under this composition is a $\mathbb{Z}/2$ cohomology class which, if γ was the reduction of a cocycle over $\mathbb{Z}$, is the reduction of the configuration space integral class associated to γ. □

If γ is not the reduction of a cocycle over $\mathbb{Z}$, then this class does not correspond in any obvious way to a configuration space integral. Notably, there are mod-2 cocycles in the graph complex which are not reductions of integral cocycles:

Example 8.2. In defect 0, there is a graph cocycle of order 5 over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ which is not the mod-2 reduction of a cocycle over $\mathbb{Z}$. This cocycle was found by Dogolazky [9] and further studied by Stanford [30]. The chord diagram terms in this cocycle are



To promote this expression to an actual graph cocycle, one would have to use the STU relation (repeatedly, for some diagrams) to determine the coefficient for every (uni)trivalent graph on two segments with ten vertices. We could then apply Proposition 8.1 to this cocycle to produce a $\mathbb{Z}/2$-valued cohomology class.

On the other hand, we do not so far have methods for detecting nontriviality of classes that are not merely mod-p reductions of configuration space integrals. Stanford showed that the cocycle described above "integrates" to zero, by considering topological relations that an invariant giving rise to it would have to satisfy. Thus it is possible that the cohomology class resulting from our construction is zero.

8.2. **The case of odd primes p.** We could also modify our construction for d odd over $\mathbb{Z}$ to work over $\mathbb{Z}/p$ for any p. In this case, we would identify a principal face with *all* the other principal faces in its isomorphism class (much like in the construction of Kuperberg and Thurston). For $p \neq 2$, signs matter, so we keep track of orientations of graphs as we did when working over $\mathbb{Z}$. As in that case, we consistently orient all the graphs in γ and then arrange for opposite signs on the same type of principal face to correspond to opposite orientations of the corresponding principal faces but the same maps to spheres, up to an even number of antipodal maps. As before, we fold and collapse the appropriate hidden faces, relegating the remaining faces to the degenerate locus. Then for a mod-p cocycle γ, the resulting space has a fundamental cycle (relative to the remaining faces) because the boundary contribution at each glued face will be a multiple of p. A generator of $H^{N(d-1)}((S^{d-1})^N/G_o, \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z})$ reduces to a nontrivial class with $\mathbb{Z}/p$ coefficients, and we pull back this class and "integrate" it using the cross product in homology. We refrain from further details, since we are not aware of any mod-p graph cocycles that are not reductions of integral cocycles for $p > 2$. (However, there are interesting mod-p *cycles*; see for example work of Turchin [32, 33] and, for the case $d = 3$, work of Budney and F. Cohen [6].)

8.3. **The case of classical knots and links, and a conjecture.** We now consider the classical case of knots and links in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and their invariants. We will consider long knots and links in this Section. Recall that invariants are just classes in $H^0(\mathcal{L}^3_m)$, and that such classes come from the defect-0 part of the graph complex. That is, they come from cocycles of (uni)trivalent diagrams.

Our method breaks down in ambient dimension $d = 3$, though only on certain faces. Specifically, in the proof of Lemma 5.16, the image under the spherical map Φ_γ of a face $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ of some $X[\Gamma]$ in Case III may be a codimension-zero subspace. We now consider necessary conditions on Γ' for $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ to be such a "problematic" face. By construction, Γ' is biconnected, and since Γ' is not principal, $|V(\Gamma')| \geq 3$. Furthermore, the valence of every free vertex in Γ' is three, and the valence of every segment vertex is one (for otherwise, $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$ has already been folded or collapsed to higher codimension). Similarly, because of the collapses we performed, Γ' must be a graph which remains connected after removing all the segments. Thus Γ' must be a whole connected component of the result of forgetting the segments from Γ. Since Γ' is biconnected, Γ' must also be a component that is crossed by no other component of Γ. These are precisely the faces for which there is no vanishing or cancellation argument in the setting of fiberwise integration of forms.

Remark 8.3. In some special cases, there are ad hoc arguments to deal with such faces. For example, for the type-2 cocycle γ in Example 7.3, the face of the tripod diagram where all 4 points collide is a codimension-1 face of X_γ, and the argument in the proof of Lemma 5.16 does not guarantee that its image under Φ_γ has positive codimension. However, on this face, the three segment vertices are collinear, so the three vectors in the image of Φ_γ are coplanar. Hence the image under Φ_γ of this face (which is part of the degenerate locus) indeed has positive codimension.

We will see shortly that if Γ is a chord diagram, then there are no problematic faces $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma')$. Furthermore, working modulo 2 allows one to glue principal faces of a space $X[\Gamma]$ to other principal faces of the same space, or to themselves, and still obtain a fundamental class. For example, if the underlying unoriented graph of Γ admits an involution, then one could glue principal faces pairwise using the involution. This gluing would also respect the "spherical" map Φ_Γ to $\mathrm{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^2)$. In particular, for closed knots, many chord diagrams Γ admit an involution which reverses the orientation of the circle. (In fact, it is unknown whether finite-type invariants distinguish a knot from the same knot with the reversed orientation.) Over $\mathbb{Z}$, the identifications would not be orientation-reversing, but this is not a problem over $\mathbb{Z}/2$.

Since our methods apply to long knots and links, we choose a different (and even simpler) method to glue principal faces of $X[\Gamma]$ modulo 2. We "fold" each principal face using a transposition $x_i \leftrightarrow x_j$ on $C_{2n}(L)$. This of course fails over $\mathbb{Z}$ because even though this gluing reverses orientation, the images of identified points under Φ_Γ differ by a single antipodal map. On the other hand, over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, we can map to $\mathbb{R}P^2$ instead, and the gluing described respects this map.

Proposition 8.4. *For any chord diagram Γ there is an associated $\mathbb{Z}/2$ link invariant from the configuration space associated to Γ.*

Proof. We consider the bundle $X[\Gamma] \to \mathcal{L}^d_m$, and we fold all the non-degenerate faces of the fiber $F[\Gamma]$. That is, we fold the principal faces as described above, and we fold the hidden faces with involution, as in Section 5.4. As in Section 5.5, we collapse each hidden face of a subgraph whose underlying unitrivalent graph $U(\Gamma)$ is disconnected. Since Γ is a chord diagram, every hidden face (not involving ∞) is such a face. Let F_Γ be the result of these identifications, and let ∂F_Γ be the remaining boundary, which consists of only faces at infinity. After all the folding, the spherical map Φ_Γ from F_Γ is well defined only as a map to $\mathrm{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^2)$, where N is the number of edges of Γ. The arguments of Lemma 5.16 show the image $\mathcal{R}$ of ∂F_γ under Φ_Γ is of positive codimension. (Indeed, the only Cases to consider are II and IV, where the arguments apply even when $d = 3$.) We thus take a generator $\omega^{(N)}$ of $H^{2N}(\mathrm{Sym}^N(\mathbb{R}P^2), \mathcal{R}; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ and pair $\Phi^*_\Gamma(\omega^{(N)})$ with the fundamental class $[F_\Gamma, \partial F_\gamma]$, producing a link invariant. □

We conclude by conjecturing that finite-type knot/link invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ can be expressed as these above classes for chord diagrams Γ, or at least linear combinations of them. More specifically, we conjecture that this method can be used to establish a formula for each finite-type invariant involving only the chord diagrams (and possibly even just one of the chord diagrams) that appear in the corresponding trivalent graph cocycle. In that case, our methods should establish simple counting formulae for these invariants over $\mathbb{Z}/2$, similar to the arrow diagram formulae of Goussarov, Polyak, and Viro [10, 26] but without any arrows or signs. Polyak and Viro establish such a formula by configuration spaces for the type-2 invariant [27]. The rough idea for all finite-type invariants appears in the tinkertoy diagrams of D. Thurston [31], though a thorough exposition in this general case has not appeared, to our knowledge. We believe that a thorough treatment would be possible over $\mathbb{Z}/2$. Note that even the mod-2 values of finite-type invariants can be useful. For example, the mod-2 values of the first four finite-type invariants separate the four simplest nontrivial knots (see the Table in [30]).

References

[1] D. Bar-Natan. On the Vassiliev invariants. *Topology*, 34(2):423–472, 1995.

[2] A. Borel. *Seminar on transformation groups*. With contributions by G. Bredon, E. E. Floyd, D. Montgomery, R. Palais. Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 46. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960.

[3] R. Bott and A. S. Cattaneo. Integral invariants of 3-manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 48(1):91–133, 1998.

[4] R. Bott and C. Taubes. On the self-linking of knots. *J. Math. Phys.*, 35(10):5247–5287, 1994.

[5] R. Bott and L. Tu. *Differential forms in algebraic topology*. Springer-Verlag, 1982.

[6] R. Budney and F. R. Cohen. On the homology of the space of knots. *Geom. Topol.*, 13(1):99–139, 2009.

[7] A.S. Cattaneo, P. Cotta-Ramusino, and R. Longoni. Configuration spaces and Vassiliev classes in any dimension. *Algebr. and Geom. Top.*, 2:949–1000, 2002.

[8] F.R. Cohen, T.J. Lada, and J.P. May. *The homology of iterated loop spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 533. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.

[9] I. Dogolazky. Eine Abhandlung über die Algebra der Schlingeldiagramme. Thesis, Universität Bonn, 1998.

[10] M. Goussarov, M. Polyak, and O. Viro. Finite-type invariants of classical and virtual knots. *Topology*, 39(5):1045–1068, 2000.

[11] W. Greub, S. Halperin, and R. Vanstone. *Connections, curvature, and homology, Vol. I: de Rham cohomology of manifolds and vector bundles*. Academic Press, 1972.

[12] M. Hirsch. *Differential topology*. Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[13] M. Kontsevich. *Feynman diagrams and low-dimensional topology*, volume 120 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 97–121. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994.

[14] Maxim Kontsevich. Vassiliev's knot invariants. In *I. M. Gel'fand Seminar*, volume 16 of *Adv. Soviet Math.*, pages 137–150. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993.

[15] R. Koytcheff. Homotopy Bott–Taubes integrals and the Taylor tower for spaces of knots and links. To appear in *J. Homotopy and Related Structures*. Also available at arXiv [math/1102.2270].

[16] R. Koytcheff. A homotopy-theoretic view of Bott–Taubes integrals and knot spaces. *Algebr. and Geom. Top.*, 9(3):1467–1501, 2009.

[17] R. Koytcheff. The Milnor triple linking number for string links via cut-and-paste topology. *Algebr. and Geom. Top.*, 14(2):1205–1247, 2014. See also arXiv [math/1209.6381].

[18] R. Koytcheff, B. Munson, and I. Volić. Configuration space integrals and the cohomology of the space of homotopy string links. *J. Knot Theory Ramif.*, 22(11):73 pp., 2013.

[19] R. Koytcheff and I. Volić. Milnor invariants of strings links, configuration space integrals, and trivalent trees. Submitted. Preprint available at [arXiv:1511.02768].

[20] G. Kuperberg and D. Thurston. Pertubative 3-manifold invariants by cut-and-paste topology. arXiv [math/9912167].

[21] C. Lescop. On the Kontsevich-Kuperberg-Thurston construction of a configuration-space invariant for rational homology 3-spheres. Prepub. Institut Fourier 655, 2004.

[22] R. Longoni. Nontrivial classes in $H^*(\mathrm{Imb}(S^1, \mathbb{R}^n))$ from nontrivalent graph cocycles. *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.*, 1(5):639–650, 2004.

[23] M. Nakaoka. Cohomology mod p of symmetric products of spheres. II. *J. Inst. Polytech. Osaka City Univ. Ser. A*, 10:67–89, 1959.

[24] K. Pelatt. A geometric homology representative in the space of long knots. arXiv:1111.3910.

[25] S. Poirier. The configuration space integral for links in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 2:1001–1050 (electronic), 2002.

[26] M. Polyak and O. Viro. Gauss diagram formulas for Vassiliev invariants. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (11):445ff., approx. 8 pp. (electronic), 1994.
[27] M. Polyak and O. Viro. On the Casson knot invariant. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 10(5):711–738, 2001. Knots in Hellas '98, Vol. 3 (Delphi).
[28] K. Sakai. Nontrivalent graph cocycle and cohomology of the long knot space. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 8(3):1499–1522, 2008.
[29] D. Sinha. Manifold-theoretic compactifications of configuration space. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 10(3):391–428, 2004.
[30] T. Stanford. Some computational results on mod 2 finite-type invariants of knots and string links. In *Invariants of knots and 3-manifolds (Kyoto, 2001)*, volume 4 of *Geom. Topol. Monogr.*, pages 363–376 (electronic). Geom. Topol. Publ., Coventry, 2002.
[31] D. Thurston. Integral expressions for the Vassiliev knot invariants. A.B. thesis, 1995. arXiv [math.QA/9901110].
[32] V. Tourtchine. Dyer-Lashof-Cohen operations in Hochschild cohomology. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 6:875–894 (electronic), 2006.
[33] V. Tourtchine. On the other side of the bialgebra of chord diagrams. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 16(5):575–629, 2007.
[34] V. Vassiliev. Cohomology of knot spaces. In V.I. Arnold, editor, *Theory of Singularities and its Applications*. AMS, Providence, RI, 1990.
[35] I. Volić. A survey of Bott-Taubes integration. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 16(1):1–42, 2007.
[36] T. Watanabe. On Kontsevich's characteristic classes for higher dimensional sphere bundles. I. The simplest class. *Math. Z.*, 262(3):683–712, 2009.
[37] T. Watanabe. On Kontsevich's characteristic classes for higher-dimensional sphere bundles. II. Higher classes. *J. Topol.*, 2(3):624–660, 2009.
[38] S.-W. Yang. Feynman integral, knot invariant and degree theory of maps. Preprint at arXiv:q-alg/9709029.

E-mail address: koytcheff@math.umass.edu

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, USA 01003